

School of Theology at Claremont



1001 1336495



Theology Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

California

ALL ABOUT THE KHILAFAT

WITH THE VIEWS OF

- - MAHATMA GANDHI - -

JUSTICE

"Our fight is not for any sectarian or racial cause. It is not for any particular country. True to the unique spirit of Islam, we do not cavil whether a person calls himself a Christian, or a Jew or a Hindu, or a Buddhist, whether he lives in the East or West. What we see is whether a man acts straight, *i.e.* acts for right, justice, and freedom. The cause of the Hindus is our cause, of the Copts in Egypt is our cause. On the other hand, if Sultan-Khalifa of the Muslim world goes wrong we will denounce him as strongly as we denounce the arch-traitor who sold his faith, his nation for gold in Arabia."

RAY & RAYCHOWDHURY

CALCUTTA

Rs. 2-4

2s. 10d. net.

BP
166.9
A2

ALL ABOUT THE KHILAFAT

WITH THE VIEWS OF

MAHATMA GANDHI & OTHERS

TOGETHER WITH

*Full Details of the Indian Khilafat Delegation in
Europe Headed by Mawlana Mohammed Ali*

IN FOUR PARTS

By

M. H. ABBAS

"Khilafat is our Kamdhenu"—Mahatma Gandhi

RAY & RAY CHOUDHURY

COLLEGE ST. MARKET.

CALCUTTA.

All rights reserved]

[Rs. 2/4/-.

CONTENTS.

PART I.—1-78.

CONCEPTION OF KHILAFAT IN ISLAM.

Introduction 1. Conception of Khilafat 2. Difference between Khilafat & Papacy 7. Purpose of Khilafat 8. Khilafat—A Religious Necessity 9. Submission to Khalifa 10. Who is Olil Amr? 12. Conditions of Khilafat & Imamatus 16. Muslim Loyalty 21. Khilafat and the Tribe of Quresh 22. Rival Khalifas 32. Sunnis & Shias 33. Jaziratul Arab 34. Ottoman Khalifas 40. British Government and the Khilafat 45. Loyalty of India to the Ottoman Khalifas 59. Europe and the Turks 62. Mr. Blunt on Ottoman Khalifas 64. Mr. Pickthall on the status of the Khalifa 66. Turkey & Khilafat 70. Prof. Nallino Answered 73.

PART II.—79-325.

INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION IN EUROPE.

Mission of the Indian Khilafat Delegation 79. Interview with Mr. Mohamed Ali 82. Khilafat Delegation at the India Office 88. Interview with Prime Minister 115. Mr. Lloyd George & Khilafat Delegation 153. Khilafat Delegation at Essex Hall 160. Delegation's Message to America 193. Delegation in Paris 197. Interview with Mr. Mohamed Ali & Mr. Syed Hosain in Paris 240. Impressions 250. Khilafat Refused Hearing 259. Kingsway Meeting 278. At Manchester 309. At Cambridge 311. Delegation at Bombay 317. Account of Work in Europe 319. Indian Muslim Delegation in Europe 323.

PART III.—326-335.

KHILAFAT AND THE TURKISH TREATY.

Turkish Peace Treaty 326. Viceroy's Message 329. Muslim Representation 331. Signatures to the Document 335.

PART IV.—357-368.

VIEWS OF NON-MOSLEMS ON KHILAFAT.

Mahatma Gandhi on Khilafat 336. Sankacharya's Views 357. Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya on Khilafat 363. Successive Khalifas of Islam 365.

330290

ALL ABOUT THE KHILAFAT

PART I.

INTRODUCTION

"Misconception, misconstruction or even misinterpretation of Islam and its tenet is not our complaint, it is

MISREPRESENTATION AND MISINFORMATION,

by which we are the chief sufferers. Things having no existence whatever in our teachings and polity have been imputed to us, and baseless charges advanced against Islam; nay the very beauties which we account amongst our exclusive possessions have been denied to us and the very evils which Islam came to eradicate and did succeed in so doing are ascribed to it. (Khawja Kamal-ud-Din).

As a result of the great world-war, the fate of the Turkish Empire has to be decided by the statesmen of Europe. It is no doubt a very complicated question, and it is perhaps on account of its complicated nature that the Peace conference is obliged to postpone it from time to time. Among the various difficulties which confront the representatives of the victorious Powers of Europe perhaps the greatest of all is the difficulty which brings them face to face with the Muslim Khilafat. The Muslim world has seen kingdom after kingdom of Islam fall a prey

to the unquenchable thirst of Christian Europe for power but the final act of dismemberment of the Turkish Empire upon which Europe is now bent has a deeper meaning than a mere blow to the temporal power of Islam. It amounts to striking at the very root of the Muslim conception of Khilafat which is a religious conception, and the great statesmen of Europe will do well to think twice before they take any step with regard to this all-important question.

The first need of Europe at the present moment is to understand clearly the Muslim conception of Khilafat.

CONCEPTION OF KHILAFAT.

The word "Khilafat" is derived from the Arabic root "Khalf" "to leave behind", and the word *Khalifa* (from *Khalafa* past tense, meaning : he came after or succeeded another that had perished or died) means primarily a successor, and hence the supreme or greatest ruler who supplies the place of him who has been before him.

Thus Khilafat constitutes in a man's serving as an agent to or a representative of another after him in a certain matter or in a certain capacity or position. This man is called *Khalifa* in Arabic philology, i.e., one who comes after and fills another's place whether his agency be due to death or removal

of that other, or to his absence or to a voluntary transfer of his authority and powers.

Ibn-i-Masud and Ibn-i-Abbas explain Khalifa as meaning one who judges among, or rules, the creatures of Allah by His command. The "Caliph" of English writers is the same, and indicates a successor of the Holy Prophet. Similarly "Caliphate" of English writer is the same word as Khilafat.

This word like several others, has been used in a particular sense in the Holy Quran, and has thereby acquired a technical meaning in the Shariat or the Code of Islam. Thus we have in the chapter entitled "An-Noor" (or the Light): "Allah has promised to those of you who believe and do good that he will most certainly make them *Khalifas* (successors or rulers) in the land as He made those to be rulers who were before them, and that He will most certainly establish for them their religion which He has chosen for them and that He will most certainly, after their fear, give them security in exchange; 'they shall serve me, not associating aught with me, and whoever is ungrateful after this, those it is who are the transgressors (24: 55).

The word "istakhlafa" which occurs here, signifies *he made him a successor or ruler*. Though the meaning here is quite plain a few commentaries may be quoted to show that the meaning of these words has never been doubtful to any Muslim Mind.

Baizawi says: "The meaning of He will make them Khalifa in the land is 'He will make them rulers

having control in the land as Kings control their kingdoms. Kashshaf has: He will make them inherit the land and make them Khalifas in it. "Ibn-i-Kasir interprets the words as meaning: He will make the followers of the Prophet rulers of the land i.e., the leaders of the people and controlling their affairs. Ibn-i-Jarir has "Allah will make them inherit the land from non-Moslem of Arabia and Ajam, so that He will make them its Kings and its chief men." Any number of other commentaries could be quoted but what has been said is sufficient to show that the clearest Divine promise is given in this verse to the Mussalmans that they shall be made Khalifas or rulers with absolute authority in the land. Thus the Khilafat in Islam means essentially absolute authority as ruling power.

The next question as to what is meant by *al-ard* the earth in the sura quoted above. Here too we would quote some commentators. Baizawi says: "The messenger of God (may peace and the blessings of God be upon him) and his companions had lived at Mecca for ten years, fearing, then they fled to Medina and lived in arms morning and evening until God fulfilled his promise and made them masters of the whole of Arabia and made them conquer the eastern and the western countries. In this there is an argument of the truth of prophethood, on account of the news of the unseen and of the Khilafat of the rightly directed Khalifas." In the Gharibal Quran we have "And the establishing of faith means

its making firm and the strengthening of its foundations. They were compelled to live at Medina in arms morning and evening, so they got tired of it and complained to the messenger of Allah (M. P. H.) and he said that they would not live thus for a little until a man shall sit in a great company at ease, there being no arms in it. So God fulfilled His promise and made them masters of Jazi-rat-ul-Arab (Peninsula of Arabia). The Kashshaf concludes similar remarks with similar words: So God fulfilled His promise and made them masters of Jazirat-ul-Arab (Peninsula of Arabia). Fath-ul-Bayan says: It is a promise that includes the whole *ummat* i.e. all the followers of the Holy Prophet and what has been said as to its particular application to the companions of the Holy Prophet, there is no ground for it. And surely he errs who says that this applies only to the four Khalifas or to the Refugees only or that by *Al-ard* is meant Mecca only. Ibnul-Arabi says it means Arabia, and countries other than Arabia is the correct view."

The verses quoted above were revealed at the time when the Musalmans just after Hijrat, were surrounded on all sides by enemies, when attacks were so incessant that ill-supplied as the Muslims were, they could not lay aside their arms for a moment. Under such circumstances some Muslims involuntarily exclaimed: Not a day have we been secure enough to lay aside our arms." "Thereupon" relates Abu Alaiya, "the above verses were revealed

and God made His prophet master of Jazirat-al-Arab and thus they became secure and put down arms.” Ubayy-bin-Ka’b reports similar events and the consequent revelation of this verse : “Then this verse was revealed and God fulfilled His promise and made them masters of Jazirat-al-Arab. Ibn-i-Kasir, writes, “This is a promise from God to His Messenger (M. P. H.) that He will make his followers Khalifas in the earth. So the Holy Prophet did not die until God brought in subjugation to him Mecca and Khaibar and the whole of Jazirat-al-Arab (Peninsula of Arabia) and the land of Yemen in its entirety.

To sum up, the words *Khilafat* (Vicegerancy) *Istikh laf fil ard* (succession to land), *Virarat wa tamak-Kun fil and* (inheritance and possession on earth) in the sura quoted above, convey the idea of national dignity and sovereignty over states, people and countries which is regarded as the greatest gift of God attainable by the nations of the world in virtue of strong faith and righteous deeds.

A perusal of the comments quoted above and of the reports of the Holy Prophet makes it clear that the Khilafat which is here promised to the Muslims implies the establishment of ruling authority over Arabia in the first place and over other territories afterwards. The great commentators have all understood this verse as the basis of the Khilafat and they have read in it a promise for the kingship of Arabia, of the whole Jaziratal Arab, as the nucleus around which was to grow the vast Muslim Empire. Arabia

was to be the central kingdom of which the Holy Prophet was the first Supreme Ruler, while around it there was promised the growth of a vast empire extending both in the east and the west. And while the Holy Prophet was made master of the central kingdom *i.e.*, Arabia, before he died this kingdom began to grow to an empire under his first successor who assumed the title of the Khalifa of the Messenger of God as soon as he came to power.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN KHILAFAT AND CHRISTIAN PAPACY.

In fact Khilafat consists in earthly power and consequently nobody can claim to be Khalifa of the Muslims unless he is possessed of full temporal powers. The view generally accepted by Europeans seems to be that the Khalifa in Islam occupies the same position as the Pope among the Christians. This is essentially incorrect and seriously misleading. In the first place, papacy is not based on any saying of Jesus Christ and is not a part and parcel of the Christian religion. As against this the Khilafat in Islam is based on the clearest injunctions of the Holy Quran supported by the sayings of the Holy Prophet and no Muslim can disregard it, though there may be a difference in the recognition of one person or another as the Khalifa such as the difference which has existed between the Sunnis and the Shias.

THE PURPOSE OF KHILAFAT.

The purpose of Allah in creating the Khilafat on earth is to set up a responsible community and government for the guidance and welfare of mankind, to establish justice, to remove oppression and tyranny, to prevent people from going astray, and to bring about peace and happiness in the world.

The word Khilafat owes its present application to the fact that the first Khalifa on earth was a vicegerant and agent of God in the establishment of His Kingdom. Adam (May peace be upon him) was the first Khalifa of God on the earth. Thus we have in the Holy Quran: And when your Lord said to the angels I am going to place in the earth a vicegerant—Khalifa (who shall rule in it) (2. 30) Hazrat Adam was followed by others in succession each of whom filled the place vacated by his predecessor and discharged the duties of the Khilafat. After the advent of Islam, however, when the inheritance of the earth devolved on the Muslims the first Khalifa or vicegerant of God among them was the Prophet Muhammad (P. B. H.). On his death this Khalifa of God was represented by those who held the central Government of Islam and who has authority over Jaziratul Arab (Peninsula of Arabia). And hence this word has been and is applied to them up to the present day.

The Khilafat of the earth has been entrusted to several people one after another who have fulfilled

the duties of defending the true religion on behalf of God.

KHILAFAT—A RELIGIOUS NECESSITY.

On the general questions as to whether or not the Khalifa is necessary for Islam, the author of the *Sharhul Mawarif* says:—"the appointment of a Khalifa is incumbent upon the united body of Moslems, according to the code of Islam.

The arguments in favour of the absolute necessity of Khalifa, being appointed are that (1) on the death of Hazrat Muhammad the Musalmans at Medina (where his death took place) at once proceeded to elect a Khalifa even before the burial had taken place ; (2) and that in the time of Hazrat Abu Bakr the first Khalifa after Hazrat Muhammad (M.P.H.) it was established by general consent and Abu Baker in his first Khutbah (address) after the death of the Holy Prophet, said ; "Beware ! Hazrat Muhammad is certainly dead, and it is necessary for this religion that some one should be appointed for its protection."

And all the Muslim at that time consented to this saying of Abu Baker, and consequently in all ages Muslims have had a Khalifa. And it is well-known that without such an officer Islam cannot be protected from evil and foreign aggression, for without him it is impossible to maintain the orders of the Muslim law, to protect the Baitullah, the two holy shrines.—Mecca and Medina, and the various ordinances of Islam.

SUBMISSION TO THE KHALIFA.

The Shariat of Islam enjoins upon every Musalman the recognition of and submission to the Khalifa as obligatory as submission to God and His apostle ; except of course when the Khalifa violates the commandments of God and the Prophet.

Islam is in fact another term for Divine Law and Nature. If the law of Islam for the evolution and well-being of mankind is framed by the same creator of heavens and earth, who has placed the life of the whole universe under a particular arrangement it is essential that the two should not be different. The former law should form a natural part of the latter just like the link of a chain. The Shariat of Islam therefore is based on this very principle. The Quran has frequently declared the truth that the existence of mankind and the physical and real life of individuals and communities is as much dependent upon this principle of concentration as that of bodies and material things. Just as the centre and axis of life and revolution of stars is the Sun, that of human being is the personality of the revered Prophets. Obedience and submission to them is indispensable for life and existence : "And we did not send any Apostle but that he should be obeyed by Allah's permission. (4.64).

Allah has appointed various spheres and centres for the maintenance of nations and communities. In matters of faith, the central position is given in belief

in the unity of God and the rest of the doctrines are expounded on the same.

In case of devotion, prayer becomes the centre. The giving up of prayers destroys the whole sphere of action. Similarly the social centre of all Muslims became the Kaaba of God in the valley of Hijaz. "Allah made the Holy Kaaba a support for the people." Since it became the centre the whole circle must incline to it. All Mussalmans must turn their faces towards it in whatever corner of the world they are. "And wherever you are, turn your faces towards it." (2.144) Just as there were centres for individual, dogmatical and practical life, it was also necessary to appoint a central personality for communal and national life and support. Such a centre was also found. The whole community was made like a circle round this centre. It was made obligatory upon every Muslim to go along with it, to be loyal to it, to obey, and move and rest with it and respond to its call and expend life and property for it in case of necessity. That obligation without fulfilling which a Mussalman cannot shake off the darkness of the Pagan days and come to the light of Islam is the centre known in the language of the Shariat as the Khalifa. So long as this centre does not leave its place *i.e.* commands in accordance with the book and the tradition, every Muslim is as much bound to obey and aid him as he is bound to obey God and the Prophet himself. "Oh you who believe! obey Allah and obey the Apostle and those in authority from

amongst you. Then if you quarrel about anything, refer it to Allah and the apostle if you believe in Allah and the last day ; this is better and profitable in the end. (4.59).

WHO IS OLIL AMR ?

The authoritative explanation by the Prophet's companions as regards "those in authority" is that it means Khalifa and Imam. Indirectly of course it includes the governor, doctors of law, and persons entrusted with the direction of public affairs all of which composed the government of Islam. The Holy Quran also seems to imply the same, thus :— "And if they had referred it to the Apostle and to those in authority among them, those who can search out the knowledge of it would have known it (4.83). It is obvious that Olil Amr (those who are in authority) cannot mean anything but Ameer and chief political authority. It cannot mean a Doctor of law in as much as the above quotations relate to political and military affairs. There are authoritative traditions narrating the circumstances under which the above verses were revealed. They relate to the question of obedience and submission to the Ameer and the Imam. The greatest doctor of law in the history of Islam, namely Imam Bukhari also holds the same view. The following well-known tradition related by Abu Hurairah is mentioned in his book. "He that obeys my Amer, obeys me, and he that disobeys my

Amer disobeys me." It shows that submission to those in authority means submission to the Amir.

Further note the following tradition. Said the Prophet (P. B. H.): I order you five things with which God has ordered me, community, obedience, Hijrat and Jihad in the way of God for verily he that goes out of the community to the breadth of a span has thrown off the yoke of Islam from his neck except if he returns ; and he that calls people as in the days of paganism, his place is hell. They said "O Prophet of God (will he suffer this) even if he keeps the fast and offers prayers. He (Prophet) said "(Yes) even if he prays and keeps fast, and thinks himself to be Musalman."

There are some things enumerated in this tradition :—The first is community *i.e.* all Muslim must live together under one Khalifa and the Imam in touch with their national centre. They must on no account live separate. The next two things are listening and obeying *i.e.* absolute submission to the Khalifa. No question of his authority is tolerated, implicit obedience is required.

Another important point to be noted here is this that in the various traditions union and submission to the Khalifa have been called the essence of national life ; while a deviation from them has been condemned as paganism and infidelity.

On the grand and memorable occasion of Hajjatul Wida (the farewell Haj) after two or three months of which he died, the Prophet made a last

and farewell address in the course of which he said, "If a slave is made to rule over you who guides you with the book, listen and obey. (Muslim). "He that goes out of obedience and forsakes the community and dies, dies the death of infidelity." Ibn-Abbas reports from the Prophet : "He that sees some things on the part of his Ameer which he dislikes should bear it patiently for verily he that forsakes the community to the width of a span and dies ; his death will be reckoned among that of the pagans." In other words the same is said thus : For verily no man goes out of obedience to the Sultan to the width of a span and dies ; but that he dies the death of an infidel."

In a tradition related by Hazrat Ibn-i-Omar it is said : "He that draws his hand from submission will meet God on the day of judgment and He shall have no excuse, and he that dies without the rope of allegiance, round his neck, dies the death of paganism. Such is the judgment of the Prophet of God against a rebel. It is no wonder then that Muslims regard the Sherif Husain as a fallen wretch.

Hafiz Nawari writes in Muslim :—"These traditions induced people to render obedience under all circumstances so that they may be united because the contrary involves disintegration of religious and secular affairs. The Prophet says : "Even though he were a mutilated slave *i.e.* listen and obey the Ameer even though he were of low extraction." Shah Waliullah of Delhi (17th century) writes in his *Hujjatullahil Balagha*

—“When a Khalifa is established on his Khilafat, and then another revolts against him, the slaying of the latter is lawful.” In an elaborate and accurate discussions on the question and nature of Khilafat the author of *Izalatul Khifa* writes:—After the Moslems have united under him it is unlawful to rebel against the Khalifa (except in case of one who shows open infidelity) even though he be not a Khalifa fulfilling all conditions. This meaning has frequently recurred.

(Vol. I. 138).

The substance of all these quotations is the same as mentioned above. It is absolutely necessary for the Muslims to have a Khalifa with temporal power and authority. If he is elected by the community he must satisfy certain conditions. But if a Muslim Government is established and somebody acquires power and authority in it, he must be acknowledged as a rightful Khalifa, whether he satisfies the conditions or not. To him every Musalman is bound to listen and obey.

The Khalifas of the Banu Umayya openly perpetrated cruelties and oppression. Innovations were so current that they would mould any tradition to their evil purposes. With all this, the revered companions of the Prophet recognised the Khalifas and tendered allegiance and submission to them. No one of them ever tried to satisfy himself before tendering submission whether the Khalifa fulfilled all the conditions of Khilafat or not. Hazrat Said son of Musib

suffered many cruelties and oppressions at their hands, and yet he was obedient to them as Khalifas of Islam. Hazrat Imam Ahmad son of Hanbal preferred to be flogged and rot in jail for several years rather than follow the call of the then Khalifas to innovations. Nevertheless he regarded them as deserving of obedience and submission and wrote in his dying declaration: "Invoke righteousness on the Commanders of the Muslims in praying, do not revolt against them with sword and do not fight with them on a mischief-stirring point (Ibn-i-Jauzi). Not a single instance can be found in the whole history of Islam amongst the Prophet's descendants and companions showing any attempt made by them to prevent people from rendering submission to the Khalifas of Banu Umayya and the Banu Abbas. On the contrary there are numerous indications in the books of traditions compiled by Imams to the effect that in spite of the declaration of their own rights and complaints about usurpation and oppression, they always refrained from denying submission or raising revolt.

CONDITIONS OF KHILAFAT AND IMAMAT.

A consideration of all the texts and arguments of the Quran and traditions as well as of popular opinion shows that the laws of Shariat in regard to the conditions of Khilafat and Imamatus have gone into two distinct directions which are quite natural to an institution like this.

According to the procedure laid down by Islam the right of electing an Imam is given to the community and not to any particular individual or family. It is the community and men of proved wisdom, who have a right to choose a Khalifa for themselves in accordance with the conditions and purpose of Khilafat ; the basis of all affairs according to Shariat being mutual consent, conference and not family or real distinction. The orthodox Khalifas had recourse to this procedure. The first Khalifa was elected in public by the community. The second was nominated by the first and acknowledged by all men of wisdom. The third was elected by the council. The fourth was paid allegiance to by the whole community. Race, family, and right of inheritance had nothing to do with their election. If it had been so, the Khilafat would have remained in the family of the first or, second, third or fourth Khalifa. It was not so. The second Khalifa did not even allow his son to be included among the members of the council.

The first form of choosing a Khalifa is this : What qualification should be sought and what conditions satisfied, if the true Islamic procedure is allowed (which is purely democratic) and people have an opportunity of electing the Khalifa ?

The second arises when the first ceases to be in force *i.e.* when people have no voice in the election of their Khalifa and the Khilafat is held and firmly established by some family or powerful individual.

Now what is the duty of the Musalman in this case according to Shariat? What should be the attitude towards the Khalifa who unworthy of his position, does not satisfy the conditions attached to Khilafat, and oppresses people? Is he to be obeyed or set aside? Is he entitled to retain Khilafat in accordance with the Shariat or not?

This being a fundamental question of society life could not possibly have been left without explanation and elucidation by Shariat. There are very clear and numerous texts on these points ; and it was due to these that after the orthodox Khalifas the revered companions of the Prophet had not the slightest hesitation in deciding upon their attitude under the tyrannical rule of the Banu Umayya. They came to an easy conclusion as though they had been previously convinced on the point. Their words and deeds were all the more confirmed by popular opinion and have up to this day been unanimously followed by Musalmans all these 13 centuries. There is no doubt that certain sections of the community differed from others as regards the first form but as to the second all are agreed upon it. As for the first form, Shariat has prescribed all those conditions which are the natural requisites of a central and important position like this as its highest and most complete standard, whether from the point of view of learning or that of temporal power and authority and since this position combines in itself, a variety of functions, there have been enumerated different

qualities for each function ; as for instance, Islam, knowledge, and foresight, good conduct, piety, courage, and personal influence, sacrifice, competence, and efficiency, power and dignity.

In book on the doctrines of faith the Musalmans have for centuries been reading and teaching that "the conditions regarding an absolute and complete authority of a Khalifa are that : he should be Muslim, free, male, sagacious, major, leader of opinion and thought, and with the aid of his dignity and position competent to enforce laws and protect the interests of Islam and do justice to the oppressed when he is oppressed, by dint of his knowledge, equity, competency and courage." (Vide *Sharhul Mawarif*, *Nasafi*, *Shahrul Maqsid*, *Fathul Bari*, *Sharah Manzumatul Adab*, *Khulasa*, &c., &c.).

As regards the second form (what should be the attitude of Musalmans according to Shariat when Islamic procedure is displaced by territorial possession and sovereignty and the public has no voice in the election of the Khalifa) authentic traditions and agreement of the majority and descendants of the Prophet on this point are clear and it has become an article of Muslim faith that if a Musalman takes possession of Khilafat and establishes his rule every Muslim is by Shariat bound to submit to him and pay allegiance just as he would submit to a deserving Khalifa. This Khalifa acquires all the rights to help and obedience given to his position by Shariat. It is not for any Muslim to turn away from him.

Nobody has a right to come forward with a fresh claim and raise the standard of revolt however much he should excel him in qualifications and fulfilment of conditions. If he does so, the duty of all believers is to help the Khalifa in suppressing and slaying him. The verdict of the Shariat as regards such person is that he is a rebel and deserves death.

Why has the Shariat given this verdict in the second class? The reason and policy of this is too obvious to require an explanation. The maintenance of Shariat and community depends upon the existence and establishment of Khilafat. In fact Khilafat is the root and all other concerns are branches to it. And therefore the best, the most sublime and rightful constitution was framed by Shariat. The foundation of Islamic government was laid on democratic and public election. Personality, race, power, kingship, or sovereignty had nothing to do with it. The necessary conditions and qualifications have also been mentioned which should be taken into consideration at the election of a Khalifa. It was also proclaimed with great emphasis, that people should not desire to be Khalifas and obtain the chieftainship for themselves nor should they fight with others as rival claimants to the Khilafat.

The Prophet always took covenant from the people: "That they will not question the authority of those who deserve it. Imam Bukhari mentions a tradition related by Abu Musa in which the Prophet is reported to have said: "Verily we will not

bestow this (governorship) on one who asks for it, nor on one who hankers after it." By so doing the Prophet has practically demonstrated to the people that one who seeks and longs for Khilafat should not be elected. This is the real constitution of the Khilafat according to Shariat.

According to the Quran, no one can be a Khalifa unless he has sufficient authority on earth, so that he may be able to administer the law and protect the religion. A Khalifa of the Muslim should not, therefore, be a creature of a non-Moslem Power. "Islam would hardly obey" says Mr. Wilfred Scarean Blunt, "another Khalifa who was himself obedient to Christendom?" Syed Ameer Ali says :—

The law requires a spiritual nexus between the supreme Imam (Khalifa) and the people : that nexus is not established if he is not an independent ruler, and the prayers are consequently invalid.

MUSLIM LOYALTY IS CONDITIONAL.

A Muslim or non-Muslim ruler cannot command the loyalty of the faithful (Muslim) living under him if that loyalty is at variance with his loyalty to his Khalifa (Imam). The loyalty to one's God and faith should always take precedence over his loyalty to a purely secular ruler. Among the Musalmans, loyalty and obedience to the Khalifa means loyalty and obedience to God. No ruler of the Muslims can legally and legitimately, according to Islamic doc-

trines expect their obedience against the authority of their Khalifa. If a Muslim or non-Muslim prince demand the obedience of his Musalman subjects he must live on terms of accord and harmony with the commander of the Faithful-Khalifa and it was therefore that in the history of Islamic peoples the politico-religious controversies which turned upon the right to the Khalifa are by far the most important.

KHILAFAT AND THE TRIBE OF QURAISH.

The question of the preservation of an Imamatus or Khilafat is one on which all the different sects in Islam are agreed and unanimous and the contention of Professor Nallino, of the University of Rome, that "Sunnite Islamism has never admitted a supreme head of the Islamic Church" is not tenable on any ground whatsoever. In fact it is not tenable even for Shias. All books of Muslim theology and jurisprudence insist on the continued existence of the Khilafat or Imamatus as essential to, and as a cardinal principle of, faith. It is clearly laid down that "the establishment of the Imamatus is one of the chief doctrines of the Muslim faith and polity." It would be unnecessary to give any more quotations to establish this point which, although not admitted by Professor Nallino, is admitted by the scholars of Europe.

There is, however, another and a more important contention that demands careful investigation.

It is alleged that the Prophet said that "the Imam should be of the tribe of Quraish." This tradition is brought forward with great solemnity and efforts are made to make a great deal of political capital out of it. The Orientalists of Europe think that they can, by the mere mention of this Tradition, gag the Musalmans and defeat the claim of the entire Sunni world of Islam that the Sultan of Turkey is the rightful and legitimate Khalifa of Islam. These so-called scholars of Arabic are in blissful ignorance of the fact that the saying just quoted was not uttered by the Holy Prophet but by the first Khalifa, Abu Bakr ; and at a time when the tribe of Quraish wielded supreme and unquestioned authority among the Arabs. On the demise of the Prophet, when some differences arose among the companions with regard to the choice of a successor of the Prophet as the Commander of the Faithful, and leader of the Mussulmans, and when the people of Medina laid claim to the Khilafat for a Medinite, Abu Bakr said, "O, People of Medina, do you not know in what high esteem the tribe of Quraish is held by the whole of Arabia?" This statement of Abu Bakr's is to be found in all authoritative books of Tradition.

If the tradition that "People followed the Quraish" is taken into account in this connection, it affords further elucidation of the fact that Hazrat Abu Bakr's argument with the people of Medina was only based on the superiority and authority of the Quraish and the acknowledgment of their chieftainship by the

Arabs. He wanted to remind the people that the Prophet himself had said that in the days of paganism as well as of Islam people have been and will be naturally influenced by the chieftainship of the Quraish ; and hence this authority *viz.*, Khilafat also will remain in their hands. Accordingly the following words of Hazrat Abu Bakr spoken to the Medinites make this point very clear. "The Arabs have known no chiefs other than those of this tribe." It was not a question of the conditions required to be fulfilled by Shariat that was under consideration. Further there is no proof of the allegation that the companions of the Prophet also believed the Quraish alone to be the rightful Khalifa. If the Khilafat were exclusively reserved for the tribe of Quraish, the Holy Prophet would not have observed that "I would have appointed Ibn-i-Umm-i-Abd, as my successor if the Khalifa could be appointed without consultation of the people." This is a Tradition reported by Tirmizi. The same collection contains another saying of the Prophet that "the Quraish will retain the Khilafat so long as they uphold and maintain the faith ; otherwise it will pass on to others." It has further been reported by Ahmed that the Prophet said : "If Abu Obeidah be alive at the time of my death I will nominate him to be the Khalifa, otherwise Mauz-ibn-Jabal will be nominated for the Khilafat." Neither of these Companions was of the tribe of the Quraish. Omar, the second Khalifa, and one of the most renowned

figures in the history of Islam, is reported to have said: "If Salim, the manumitted slave of Abu Huzaifa, were living, I would not have given precedence to any other over him." The *Sharh-i-Maqasid*," one of the most notable books on Muslim Theology, contains the following saying of the great Imam Razi, the Rhazes of Europe: "Khilafat is the temporal and religious headship of Islam which can be bestowed upon any Mussulman." The "*Sharh-i-Maqasid*," the "*Sharh-i-Mawaqif*, the *Musamara*," and other books of authority most unambiguously lay it down that "in the absence of a sufficiently powerful and strong personality belonging to the tribe of Quraish even a non-Arab can lawfully become the Khalifa."

To assert that the Sultan of Turkey is not the proper Khalifa would be to ignore the clearest admissions of Christian and European historians of Islam themselves who flourished not so long ago. The concluding statements in Muir's "*Caliphate*," a book regarded by Professor Margoliouth as of great authority, proves the statement made above. But why go to musty books and authors long departed? Even to-day we can get conclusive proofs on the point in every mosque every Friday, where, in supplications to Allah for the protection of Islam and the Commander of Faithful, the present Sultan of Turkey is clearly designated the Khalifa and Defender of the Faith. An American writer has contributed an article entitled, "The Sultan is not the

Caliph," to the "New Europe." He affirms, on the authority of a disconnected phrase of Ibn-i-Khaldun and an unknown book on the principles of the Islamic Faith, said to have been printed in Delhi, that it is essential for a Khalifa to be of the tribe of Quraish. We wish the writer had quoted Ibn-i-Khaldun *in extenso*, because the reader would then have found that a little further on the same famous author states that Khilafat is in no sense exclusive to the Quraish. It is a literary crime to try to establish one's contentions by wrenching incomplete statements from their contexts and quoting disconnected passages from great authorities only to misrepresent them.

But the important fact is that an essential institution such as the Khilafat does not rest on any technicalities that have to be rescued by interested parties from a dusty herbarium and garnished up afresh with half-truths and untruths. Islam is a complete synthesis, a perfect whole, an entire unit, combining things spiritual and things temporal, and it has for its central figure the person and office of the Khalifa who must have adequate temporal power to defend the Faith and the Faithful and prevent the outraging of Muslim conscience in every region. The ideal arrangement is the choice of the most pious Mussulman and the concentration of all power in his hands, as the head of the Islamic Theocracy, which is a true Republic. This ideal was materialised in the Khilafat of the first

four Khalifas, known as "the Truly Guided Khalifas." But even then practical considerations led the Companions of the Prophet to select one of the tribe of the Quraish so that he could control that powerful tribe and lead it in the Path of Allah.

Later the Omayyide kings were accepted as Khalifas because they had the greatest power and willingly placed it at the disposal of the Faith for its defence. Abbaside kings succeeded them and were for similar reasons accepted as the Khalifas. The Mamelukes could well have claimed the Khilafat for the same reasons, after 1258 when Baghdad was sacked ; but instead of that they retained the scions of the Abbasides as Khalifas and acknowledged them along with the rest of the Islamic world. When the Sultan of Turkey conquered Egypt he was clearly marked out for the Khilafat, and would have been accepted without any further formalities if the world of Islam agreed. But he fortified his position by an act of cession and the Khilafat was transferred to him with the consent of the Islamic world without bitter controversy or bloodshed.

In other words, for the same reason that Abu Bakr, recognising the force of circumstances, asserted that the Khalifa should then be of the tribe of Quraish, the Muslim world for four centuries has asserted, without contradiction, that the Khalifa should now be the head of the Ottoman Empire. The saying of Abu Bakr is an incontrovertible

argument for the preservation of the temporal power of the Khilafat, and cannot be used as an excuse for narrowing down the choice of the Muslim Republic to members of a particular tribe, which is entirely at variance with the spirit of Islam, as we understand it. Far more rational would be the total denial of that choice and the substitution of a direct hereditary succession which the Shiah persuasion claims.

But, in any case, it does not lie in the mouth of anyone in this country to deny the title of the Sultan of Turkey to the Khilafat when the Earl of Mornington, afterwards the Marquis of Wellesley, Governor-General of India, sought and obtained the assistance of the Ottoman Khalifa at a critical moment in the history of British expansion in India, and addressed to Tipu Sultan on January 16, 1799, a letter in which he exhorted the latter to cut off all connection with Napoleon and the French, and buttressed his own arguments with a letter addressed to Tipu Sultan by Sultan Selim dated Constantinople September 20, 1798, and delivered to Mr. Spencer Smith, His Britannic Majesty's Minister. The Governor-General refers to this letter of Sultan Selim as an exhortation to Tipu "to manifest your zeal for the Mussulman faith, by renouncing all intercourse with the common enemy of every religion, and the aggressor of the Head of the Mahomedan Church," and expresses the hope that "when your discerning mind shall have duly

examined this respected letter, you will no doubt draw the following conclusions from it.....

“Secondly, that the French have insulted and assaulted the acknowledged Head of the Mahomedan Church ; and that they have wantonly raised an unprovoked and cruel war in the heart of the country which is revered by every Mussulman as the repository of the most sacred Monuments of the Mahomedan Faith.”

Is it too much to expect that the English would still regard the Ottoman Sultan as the “acknowledged Head of the Mahomedan Church” and themselves spare what their Governor-General regarded as “the heart of the country which is revered by every Mussulman Faith”? Mussalmans still acknowledge the Sultan as the Head of their Theocracy and revere the country which is still the repository of the Most Sacred Monuments of their Faith. The lapse of a century and a quarter has added force to the prescription of the centuries that had gone before and endeared all the more both the Khalifa and the Khilafat to hundreds of millions of Mussulmans all the world over.

THE GREAT HISTORIAN IBN-I-KHALDUN ON QURESH PROBLEM.

The wonders and subtleties displayed in the work of the great historian Ibn-i-Khaldun will never be exhausted even to the last day. Every book,

every chapter and arrangement of the same, every heading and interpretation is a living testimony to and strong proof of, the knowledge of this wonderful jurist. Take for instance the question of Khilafat itself and see how accurately he has solved all difficulties and how nicely he has exposed the law of Shariat on this point merely by arranging chapters in a certain order. The first point is to see as to what the central constitution of Islam is in this respect. The first chapter in this book is headed as "Obey God and the Prophet and those of you who are in authority" and by inserting the Hadis (tradition) "He that obeys my Ameer obeys me." The author has shown that this central authority is the book of God, the Prophet, and then the Khalifa and Imam. None but the Khalifa can be '*Ulil Amir*' (man in authority). Submission to him (provided that he does not command against Shariat) is as binding as submission to God and the Prophet. The next chapter is "Omara (Khalifas or chiefs) will be from the Quraish : and in this connection he has related the tradition reported by Ibn-i-Jubair, "as long as they strengthen the faith." i.e. as long as the Quraish will have the capacity to keep the commandments of religion, Khilafat will remain among them. Thus he has made it clear that Khilafat of the Quraish for certain period was prophesied. It is not essential, however, that Khalifa should always be a Quraish. It is only a prophecy and foreshadowing of future events, like

many other incidents which have been similarly foretold. The Khilafat attributed to the Quraish is qualified with "*Ma aqamud din*" i.e. as long as they keep up the religion. Afterwards the author turns to another important subtlety and assigns a chapter to "The reward of one who decides disputes with wisdom." It is a pity that people have not realized the actual basis of the arrangement and order of this chapter. After establishing the real position of Khilafat, the next point for consideration is: 'what is the guiding principle of the Khalifa's action?' 'What is the source of this guiding principle? Ibn-i-Khuldun wants to make it clear that it is based on wisdom—Hikmat i.e. on the methods adopted by the revered Prophets for the development of masses which of course in the real and wide sense means Sunnat (tradition). In the language of the Quran Hikmat (wisdom) is another name for Sunnat (tradition) of the Prophets. In interpreting this chapter the great historian quotes the following from the Quran in support of his argument:—"They who do not rule in accordance with what Allah has sent, are mischievous." Decision and rule must conform to what God has sent, for the contrary involves mischief. "What God has sent" is the Book and Sunnat, "and he teaches them the Book and wisdom" (Quran).

Obviously the conclusion is that wisdom and the model of the Prophet should form the basis of the

Khalifa's policy. There are more explicit and clear traditions in this connection.

Having passed these stages it remained for him to show how submission to the Central personality (Khalifa) was incumbent on the Muslims. He therefore dealt with it under the chapter, "Listening and obedience is due to the Imam (Khalifa) except in case of his disobeying God." Under this chapter he has collected all those traditions which contain very clear texts regarding submission to the Khalifa. He must be obeyed so long as he is a Musalman and keeps up prayers. No Musalman has a right to disobey him.

RIVAL KHALIFAS.

If, after the rule of one Khalifa has been established, another claimant makes appearance, the verdict of the law is that he is a rebel and shall be slain. His life is a danger to the peace and order of the whole community. He wants to create dissension and destroy the established rule and constitution, while mischief is more harmful than slaughter (Quran).

Farjatul Ashjai says that he heard the Prophet of God (Peace be upon him) say "when your kingdom is established under one man and somebody comes with a view to break up your federation, slay him" (Ahmad and Muslim).

A majority of the Moslem theologians have therefore agreed that if the rule of a Khalifa is once

established whether worthy or unworthy, it is permitted to the Muslims to fight and slay the man who revolts against him (for he is a rebel), provided that he (the rebel) does not refrain from his activities even after being called to satisfy his doubts. Some people are of opinion that it is not only permitted but rather incumbent on us to do so according to "Fight that which causes disturbance. (Quran. 49.9).

It is narrated in Al Bahar on the authority of the Prophet's pure descendants that Jihad against these people is more honourable than against infidels in other lands ; because this action of theirs in the land of Islam (Peace) is like a vice committed in mosque (Nailul Autar, Vol. 7, P. 80).

SUNNIS & SHIAS.

The Sunnis and the Shias are not at variance with each other on the question of the Khilafat itself. Their difference consisted only with regard to candidature. But when a Khalifa is established every one is bound to obey him. There is no difference between the two sects on this point. The Shias hold that the right of electing a Khalifa belongs exclusively to the descendants of the Prophet—they alone can be elected as Imams, Khalifas. The Sunni faith maintains that descent from a Prophet is not a necessary condition, but in case the true constitution is extinct, and the central government of Islam is taken possession of by some powerful persons or families, the

Shias are as much agreed on rendering submission to them as all the Sunni sects. According to the Sunnis the truly guided Khalifas alone combine all the requisite conditions in themselves and their election also was made strictly in accordance with the constitution of Shariat. It ceased to be in force afterwards. The Shias hold that it was never acted upon. However the Sunnis as well as the Shias took upon themselves submission and obedience in both these periods. The result is that both of them are even now unanimous in submitting and rendering obedience to an established and ruling Muslim Empire. Thus we see that there can be no question of difference between these two great sects of Islam as to the established fact of the Ottoman Khilafat.

JAZIRAT-UL-ARAB AND THE HOLY PLACES.

From what we have said above it would be clear that the promise of the Khilafat to the Muslims has always been understood by the best authorities as amounting to a promise for the establishment of an Empire of which Arabia being the centre was always to be an essential part. Without this Empire and without rule over Arabia the Khilafat is meaningless. Arabia was the central kingdom in this empire in the sense that while other portions of the empire might change, Arabia could not. In other words the Muslim Empire which was the supreme ruling authority over Arabia was the Khilafat whatever other

lands may be in its possession. There might be other great Muslim empires in the world, but the Khilafat rested with the one which was the master of Arabia. This is clear from the following considerations :—

(1) The Holy Prophet Hazrat Muhammad was personally made to rule over the whole of Arabia. Though it was not all conquered by him by force of arms, yet the whole of it became subject to him before his death, as deputations from tribe after tribe of the vast peninsula waited upon him, and there remained not a single tribe in Arabia which did not owe allegiance to him. This becomes the more significant when it is borne in mind that Arabia was composed of heterogeneous elements and had never within historical times owed allegiance to a single ruling head. As the Khilafat means a successorship to the Holy Prophet, the Jaziratul Arab or the Peninsula of Arabia, being the kingdom which the Holy Founder of Islam left at his death became an essential part of the Khilafat and so long as the Muslim Khilafat exists in the world and this shall be so long as Islam remains in the world—Jaziratul Arab (the peninsula of Arabia) must remain an essential part of the Khilafat. If Arabia is lost to the Khilafat he cannot be called a Khalifa or a successor of the Holy Prophet because he does not possess what the Holy Prophet possessed. The very word Khalifa makes it obligatory that he shall have authority over Arabia.

It now remains to know what is meant by Jaziratul Arab (literally the island of Arab). The word "Jaziratul Arab" has been used in the traditions. The holy prophet Hazrat Mahammad used the word Jazira (island) and since then the term Jaziratul Arab has been applied to a particular country namely Arabia. It shall therefore be used in the same sense in which it was then understood and is still taken to mean. All the historians and ancient geographers are agreed that Arabia is called an island because it is surrounded on three sides by sea and on the 4th by rivers. Its boundaries are the Indian ocean, the Persian Gulf, the Red Sea, and the river Euphrates and the Tigris. Fathul Bari and other books contain the following :—Jaziratul Arab is so called because it is surrounded by the Persian Gulf, the Abyssinian Sea and the Euphrates and Tigris. (6 118).

Imam Zahari describes it thus :—Jaziratul Arab is so called because it is surrounded on two sides by the Persian Gulf and the Abyssinian Sea and on the north by the Euphrates and Tigris. Lexicographers like Qamus held the same view. Prof. Peter of Bustan a well-known modern Christian writer of Syria who began to compile an Arabic Encyclopadia—gives the same boundaries of the island of Arabia.

The Mediterranean Sea was known to the ancient geographers as the Egyptian or the Syrian Sea. On it is situated Beyrut, and if we look into the interior we well find the same place where the

river took its rise and flowed down to the Persian Gulf. Thus there is a triangular piece of land enclosed by sea. Only a small piece is left in the north on the left of Euphrates *i.e.* Syria. This triangular piece is Jaziratul Arab. The ancient and modern geographers are unanimous on this point. Those who have enumerated the boundaries have mentioned that it is surrounded in the North by Tigris. Asmai says :—In length it extends from the other side of Aden to the fertile regions of Mesopotamia, and from Jedda and sea-coast to the borders of Syria in breadth. The explanation given by the author of Mujaan together with the accounts of other writers shows that Arabia extends from Aden to the fertile land of Mesopotamia and from the coast of Red Sea to the Persian Gulf in breadth. Its northern boundary is the river Tigris on the right and if a line be drawn on the left, it comprises of Syria. In modern geographies too the same boundaries are given. Thus it is said that Arabia is bounded on the North by Syria, on the South by the Indian Ocean, on the East by the Persian Gulf, and on the West by the Red Sea.

In the Majamul Buldan the reason of this denomination is said to be this :—Because it is the lowest of land of the Arabian people. This shows that Mesopotamia (Iraq) also is included in Arabia.

In the Sahih Bukhari there is a report from Ibn-i-Abbas, according to which the Holy Prophet made a bequest on his death-bed in the following

words :—“Expel the non-Moslems from Jazirat-ul-Arab.” There is also a report in the Sahih Muslim, according to which Hazarat Umar is reported to have said that he heard the Holy Prophet saying :—“I shall surely expel the Jews and the Christians from Jaziratul Arab so that I shall not leave therein anyone but a Muslim,” while according to another report his words were : “If I live I shall certainly expel the Jews and the Christians from Jaziratul Arab.” Why should the Prophet have so much concern on account of Arabia if it had no connection with the Khilafat. The religion of Islam preaches liberality to the utmost towards the followers of other religions so much so that it not only recognises, but also requires its followers to believe in the Divine origin of all the great religions of the world, and this was the reason that while the Christians had set an example for the Muslims as to the uprooting of all alien religions wherever they had the upper hand, every Muslim country contains more or less a non-Muslim element. But Arabia was made an exception not because the Holy Prophet feared that the Arabian Muslim could not withstand an alien religion but because Arabia being the central Muslim Kingdom of the Khilafat or the Promised Muslim Empire, was to be kept free from the machinations of those who might be planning the destruction of Islam. The special mention of the Jews and the Christians in this connection in the Holy Prophet’s report is noteworthy. This shows conclusively that special sanctity was conferred

on Arabia by the Holy Prophet owing to the special position which it had in the Khilafat.

Besides the Khilafat other Muslim empires have existed, sometimes very great ones, such as the Mughal Empire in India, but they had never been recognised as Khilafat owing to the simple fact that they did not rule over Arabia. On the other hand, notwithstanding their own greatness such empires recognised the Khilafat.

Throughout the thirteen centuries that have elapsed since the birth of Islam Arabia has always remained under the Khalifa. It may be that the control of Khilafat over every portion of the Peninsula has not been uniform through the many vicissitudes but theoretically Arabia has always been a part of Khilafat. We may only add that when such control was not complete the Khilafat could not be regarded as sufficiently strong, but never has any one been recognised as Khalifa who had no control over Arabia. It is difficult to refer here to the history of the Khilafat at length to show how it has always spent its best efforts to keep Arabia under its control, but a brief reference to some of the more important struggle would not be out of place here. It was at first under the very first Khalifa that certain tribes tried to assume independence but Hazrat Abu Bakar the first Khalifa was successful in bringing them all to subjugation. Towards the end of Hazrat Osman's reign there was again a civil disturbance, but Hazrat Ali the immediate successor of Hazrat Osman was un-

doubted master of the whole of Arabia again. Under Muawiya Arabia was still a province of the empire and so it remained under all the Umayya Khalifas except for the struggle of Abdulla Bin Zubair which ultimately came to nought. Under the Abasides the same condition was maintained and the governors of the different districts of Arabia were appointed by the Khalifa. Since the Khilafat has passed to the Turks, the whole of Arabia has still been theoretically a part of the Turkish Empire though the control of Turkey may not have been in practice complete over this or that portion. If such control was lax at some time, it does not mean that the Turks did not consider Arabia as an essential part of the empire but because financially there was not much advantage. Still it was the Turks who subdued with the help of Muhammad Ali, the great Wahabi movement in Central Arabia and towards the end of the 18th century made again a strong effort to put down rebellion in Yemen.

OTTOMAN KHALIFAS.

The Khilafat proper lasted for 30 years as previously related. It commenced in the 11th year of Hijra and continued on to the 41st. Then began the age of the Banu Umayya which lasted from 41 to 132 A. H. After that it underwent a new change and the Abbaside period commenced, which constitutes by far the largest period of Khilafat. It lasted from

132 to 656 Hijra. Now the government had remained in the same family for full five centuries, and all the mental, physical, social and political corruption had attained their zenith in this age.

Baghdad the seat of the Abbaside Khilafat was sacked by Halaku Khan in 656 Hijra and the blood of Mutasim Billa the last Abbaside Khalifa, sealed the end of the Quraish and Arab Khilafat.

Some two or four of the Abbaside dynasty escaped the massacre of Baghdad among whom was Mutasm's uncle Ahmad son of Tahir. He reached Egypt in 668 Hijra where the Mamluk family of Aiyub was in power, and Malik Zahir Babrus was king. When he came to know of the antecedents of Ahmad, he (Babrus) recognised him (Ahmad) as the rightful Khalifa and placed his hands into those of Ahmad, thereby rendering dutiful submission.

Ahmad son of Tahir assumed the title of Al-Mustansir Billah and with the aid and co-operation of Babrus tried to deliver Baghdad from the hands of the Tartars. His attempts, however, failed and he attained martyrdom in battle. Again there came a crisis when Khilafat was well nigh lost to the Quraish. The prophecy of "so long as there remain two of them" however, displayed its wonderful significance. There was another Abbaside named Abul Abbas Ahmed son of Ali who had escaped from the massacre of Baghdad and taken refuge in Aleppo. When Babrus heard of him he brought him to Egypt with great honour and did homage to him as Khalifa.

He was subsequently known as Hakim Bi Amrillah, and his dynasty held the Khilafat of Egypt for 263 years that is from 660 to 923 Hijra. In the meanwhile, the Moslem world had emerged out of two centuries of catastrophies and vicissitudes and assumed a new form. The empire of the Ottoman Turks had been established over Constantinople and was spreading in all directions over Asia and Europe. In 923 A. H. (1517 A.D.) Sultan Salim Khan acquired possession of Egypt and the last Abbaside Khalifa Al Mutawakkil entrusted him with all the duties and distinction of Khilafat and rendered allegiance too. Besides power and authority Al Mutwakkil also handed over to him several articles most important of which were the keys of the holy places and the two Harems (Mecca and Medina) and some insignia of the Prophet, namely the sword, the flag, and the sheet of the Prophet. These articles are preserved in Constantinople as emblems of Khilafat to this day. This is the history of the Ottoman Sultans being recognised as Khalifas in the whole world and prayed for on pulpits in Hijaz, Egypt, Syria, India, etc., as Amirul Momenin (Commander of the Faithful). The responsibility of Haj also which constitutes important function of the Khilafat fell to them.

This is the history of the Khilafat in general. If the Abbaside Khalifa Mutwakkil had not rendered allegiance to Sultan Selim even then in consequence of the forthcoming events, the Khilafat of the Islamic

world should naturally have been placed in the hands of the Turks. According to Islamic laws, that Muslim power alone can discharge the functions of Khilafat, which is the greatest Muslim Empire, and has the greatest power to defend Shariat (Islamic laws) and community. Knowing the changes which had taken place in the Muslim empires during the last 400 years who can say that this responsibility could have been given to any other nation? In India itself the Mughal empire was at its height and Mughal emperors regarded themselves as Imams within their territory. They never thought, however, of asserting any claims to the Khilafat of Islam, and had they even done so the world would not have been prepared to recognise their claims.

After the Abbaside Khalifas none but the Ottoman Turks possessed all these qualities which from the beginning up to now, the Musalmans have by their actions generally been recognised to be the requisites of Khilafat. No other Muslim empire was ever able to acquire that power and influence.

In short from the time of Sultan Selim Khan I up to the present day the Ottoman Sultans have been Khalifas of the Muslim world, and during the four centuries which have passed not a single rival claimant has ever arisen against them. In the reign of the Banu Umayya and the Banu Abbas we may find a struggle between a number of rival and adverse claimants but as for the history of Khilafat under the

Ottoman Sultan no amount of research for such men can be of any avail. There may have been a hundred claimants to the empire, but none has ever asserted a title to the central Khilafat of Islam. The Turks have for centuries held the sword for the protection of Islam and Muslim countries. It is they whose bosoms have been wounded in the way of Islam for so many centuries. It is they alone whose corpses have been tossed about in dust and blood, it is they to whose charge Muslims of the world have safely entrusted the defence of the Muslim centre. Every Muslim, from whatever corner of the world he may be, standing as he is in the fields of Arafat proceeding to perform the fourth part of the ceremony of Haj, has to acknowledge the religious authority of the Ottoman Imam and conduct his Haj under the agent of the Ottoman Khalifa.

The mischief which Sharif Hosain has created by siding with the hostile non-Muslem troops and separating Hijaz from Constantinople is a temporary revolt and not recognised by Shariat as lawful. According to the Muslim law, Hejaz still forms part of the empire of the Khalifa of Constantinople. It is the duty of all the Musalmans of the world to rescue the sacred harems from the grasp of the rebels and continue their efforts in this direction until the rebels have been punished and rebellion wholly suppressed. If they fail to do so every one of them shall have to answer for it before God.

BRITISH GOVERNMENT AND THE KHILAFAT.

SOME HISTORICAL FACTS.

The following "Correspondence between Tippu Sultaun and the Governor General" is given in Appendix (C) of a book, printed by Luke Hansard, Lincoln's Inn Fields, for T. Cadell, Junion, and W. Davies, in the Strand, in 1800, and entitled, "A Review of the Origin, Progress, and Result of the Decisive War with the late Tippu Sultaun, in Mysore : with notes ; by James Salmond, Esq., of the Bengal Military Establishment, to which are added an Appendix, containing Translations of the Principal State Papers found in the Cabinet of Tippoo Sultaun ; and other important Official Papers. Together with a Dedication to the Right Hon. Henry Dundas, by M. Wood, Esq., Colonel, and late Chief Engineer, Bengal." It will be obvious to our readers that at a critical moment in the expansion of the British Empire in the East the Government of India and the authorities in London did not hesitate to recognise the Sultan of Turkey as the "acknowledged Head of the Mahomedan Church" and his territories "as the repository of the most sacred Monuments of the Mohamedan Faith." We hope that the publication of this correspondence will once for all stop the present day exponents of British Imperialistic policy from taking up an attitude that their forbears hesitated to take up. If the principle of estoppel has any sense behind it we make bold to assert that so far as

the British Government is concerned the matter was once for all finally settled for them by Lord Mornigton, so far back as January 16, 1799 :—

TO TIPPOO SULTAN.

Written 16th January, 1799.

Your Highness has already been furnished by Lord Clive with a translation of the declaration of war, issued by the Sublime Porte against the French, in consequence of their having violated the sacred obligations of Treaty with the Grand Seignior, and of their having invaded Egypt, in contempt of every principle of good faith, and of the Law of Nations. You have also received from me a translation of the manifesto, published by the Porte on the same occasion, exposing, in just colours, the overbearing and arrogant spirit, as well as the treachery and falsehood, which the French have disclosed in their conduct towards all mankind, and especially towards the Sublime Porte.

The Porte, justly outraged by an aggression so atrocious and unprecedented as the invasion of Egypt, has now united in a common cause with the British Nation, for the purpose of curbing the intemperance of the French ; and the Grand Seignior, having learnt the unfortunate alliance which your Highness has contracted with his enemies the French, against his friends and allies the British Nation, his Highness resolved, from motives of friendship towards

you, as well as towards the British Nation, to warn you, in an amicable letter, of the dangers of this fatal connexion ; and to exhort you to manifest your zeal for the Mussulmán faith, by renouncing all intercourse with the common enemy of every religion, and the aggressor of the head of the Mahomedan Church.

Accordingly this letter (the testimony of friendship, and the fruit of wisdom, piety, and faithful zeal) was delivered by the Ministers of the Porte, under the Grand Seignior's orders, to Mr. Spencer Smith, the British Minister resident at Constantinople, by whom it was transmitted to the Honourable Mr. Duncan, Governor of Bombay, who has forwarded it to Lord Clive. The day before yesterday this letter reached Madras, and a translation accompanied it, by which I learnt the valuable lessons of prudence and truth which it contains. I now forward it to your Highness. You will read and consider it with the respectful attention which it demands. There you will find the same friendly admonitions respecting the dangerous views of the French Nation, which I have already submitted to your consideration.

When your discerning mind shall have duly examined this respected letter, you will, no doubt, draw the following conclusions from it :

First.—That all the maxims of public law, honour, and religion, are despised and profaned by the French Nation, who consider all the thrones of the world, and every system of civil order and religious faith, as the sport and prey of their bound-

less ambition, insatiable rapine, and indiscriminate sacrilege.

Secondly.—That the French have insulted and assaulted the acknowledged Head of the Mahomedan Church ; and that they have wantonly raised an unprovoked and cruel war in the heart of that country, which is revered by every Mussulman as the repository of the most sacred Monuments of the Mahomedan Faith.

Thirdly.—That a firm, honourable, and intimate alliance and friendship now subsists between the Grand Seignior and the British Nation, for the express purpose of opposing a barrier to the excesses of the French.

Fourthly.—That the Grand Seignior is fully apprized of the intercourse and connexion unhappily established between your Highness and the French, for purposes hostile to the British Nation ; that he offers to your Highness the salutary fruit of that experience, which he has already acquired, of the ruinous effects of French intrigue, treachery, and deceit ; and that he admonishes you not to flatter yourself with the vain hope of friendly aid from those who (even if they had escaped from the valour and skill of the British forces) could never have reached you until they had profaned the tomb of your prophet, and overthrown the foundations of your religion.

May the admonition of the head of your own faith dispose your mind to the pacific propositions which I have repeatedly, but in vain, submitted to

your wisdom ! And may you at length receive the Ambassador, who will be empowered to conclude the definite arrangement of all difference between you and the allies, and to secure the tranquillity of India against the disturbers of the world !

(Signed) MORNINGTON.

A TRUE COPY.

N. B. EDMONSTONE,

P. T. to the Government.

TRANSLATION.

LETTER from Sultan Selim to the Indian Sovereign, Tippoo Sultaun, dated Constantinople, 20th September, 1798, delivered to Mr. Spencer Smith, His Britannic Majesty's Minister Plenipotentiary, etc.

We take this opportunity to acquaint your Majesty when the French Republic was engaged in a war with most of the Powers of Europe within this latter period, our Sublime Porte not only took no part against them, but, regardful of the ancient amity existing with that nation, adopted a system of the strictest neutrality, and shewed them even such acts of countenance, as have given rise to complaints on the part of other Courts.

Thus friendly disposed towards them and reposing a confidence in those sentiments of friendship which they appeared to profess for us, we gave no ear to many propositions and advantageous offers,

which had been made to us to side with the Billigerent Powers ; but, pursuant to our maxims of moderation and justice, we abstained from breaking with them without a direct motive, and firmly observed the line of neutrality ; all which is notorious to the world.

In this posture of things, when the French having witnessed the greatest marks of attention from our Sublime Porte, a perfect reciprocity was naturally expected on their side, when no cause existed to interrupt the continuance of the peace betwixt the two nations, they, all of a sudden, have exhibited the unprovoked and treacherous proceedings, of which the following is a sketch :

They began to prepare a fleet in one of their harbours, called Toulon, with most extraordinary mystery ; and, when completely fitted out and ready for sea, embarked a large body of troops ; and they put also on board several people versed in the Arabic language, and who had been in Egypt before : They gave the command of that armament to one of their Generals, named Buonoparte, who first went to the Island of Malta, of which he took possession and thence proceeded direct for Alexandria ; where, being arrived the 17th Muharem, all of a sudden landed his troops, and entered the town by open force, publishing soon after manifestoes in Arabic among the different tribes, stating in substance that the object of their enterprize was not to declare war against the Ottoman Porte, but to attack the Beys of Egypt, for insults and injuries they had committed

against the French Merchants in time past ; that peace with the Ottoman Empire was permanent ; that those of the Arabs who should join would meet the best treatment, but such as shewed opposition would suffer death ; with this further insinuation, made in different quarters, but more particularly to certain courts at amity with us, that the expedition against the Beys was with the privity and consent of the Sublime Porte ; which is a horrible falsity. After this they also took possession of Roseetta, not hesitating to engage in a pitched battle with the Ottoman troops, who had been detached from Cairo to assist the invaded.

It is a standing law among all nations, not to encroach upon each other's territories, whilst they are supposed to be at peace. When any such events take place as lead to a rupture, the motives so tending are previously made known between the parties, nor are any open aggressions attempted against their respective dominions, until a formal declaration of war takes place.

Whilst therefore no interruption of the peace, nor the smallest symptom of misunderstanding, appeared between our Sublime Porte and the French Republic, a conduct so audacious, so unprovoked, and so deceitfully sudden on their part, is an undeniable trait of the most extreme insult and treachery.

The province of Egypt is considered as a region of general veneration, from the immediate proximity of the noble city of Mecca, the Kebleh of the Mussul-

mans (the point of the compass to which all Turks turn their face in performing their prayers) and the sacred town of Medina, where the tomb of our Blessed Prophet is fixed ; the inhabitants of both these sacred cities deriving from thence their subsistence.

Independent of this, it has been actually discovered from several letters which have been intercepted, that the further project of the French is to divide Arabia into various republics ; to attack the whole Mahomedan Sect in its religion and country ; and, by a gradual progression, to extirpate all Mussulmans from the face of the earth.

It is for these cogent motives and considerations that we have determined to repel this enemy, and to adopt every vigorous measure against these persecutors of the faith ; we placing all confidence in the Omnipotent God, the source of all succour, and in the intercession of him who is the Glory of Prophets.

Now, it being certain that, in addition to the general ties of religion, the bonds of amity and good understanding have ever been firm and permanent with your Majesty, so justly famed for your zeal and attachment to our faith ; and that more than once such public acts of friendly attention have been practised between us, as to have cemented the connection subsisting between the two countries ; we therefore sincerely hope, from your Majesty's dignified disposition, that you will not refuse entering into concert with us, and giving our Sublime Porte every possible assistance by such an exertion of zeal as

your firmness and natural attachment to such a cause cannot fail to excite.

We understand that, in consequence of certain secret intrigues carried on by the French in India (after their accustomed system) in order to destroy in settlements and to sow dissensions in the provinces of the English there, a strict connection is expected to take effect between them and your Majesty, for whose service they are to send over a corps of troops by the way of Egypt.

We are persuaded that the tendency of the French plans cannot in the present days escape your Majesty's penetration and notice ; and that no manner of regard will be given to their deceitful insinuations on your side ; and whereas the Court of Great Britain is actually at war with them, and our Sublime Porte engaged on the other hand in repeling their aggressions, consequently the French are enemies to both : and such a reciprocity of interests must exist between those Courts as ought to make both parties eager to afford every mutual succour which a common cause requires.

It is notorious that the French, bent upon the overthrow of all sects and religions, have invented a new doctrine, under the name of Liberty ; they themselves professing no other belief but that of Dehrees (Epicureans or Pythagoreans), that they have not even spared the territories of the Pope of Rome, a country, since time immemorial, held in great reverence by all European nations ; that they have wrested

and shared with others the whole Venetian State, notwithstanding that fellow-Republic had not only abstained from taking part against them, but had rendered them service during the course of the war, thus effacing the name of the Republic of Venice from the annals of history.

There is no doubt that their present attempt against the Ottomans, as well as their ulterior designs (dictated by their avaricious view, towards Oriental riches), tend to make a general conquest of that country (which may God never suffer to take effect) and to expel every Mussulman from it, under pretence of annoying the English. Their end is to be once admitted in India, and then to develop what really lies in their hearts, just as they have done in every place where they have been able to acquire a footing.

In a word, they are a nation whose deceitful intrigues and perfidious pursuits know no bounds ; they are intent on nothing but on depriving people of their lives and properties, and on persecuting religion, wherever their arms can reach.

Upon all this, therefore, coming to your Majesty's knowledge, it is sincerely hoped that you will not refuse every needful exertion towards assisting your brethren Mussulmans, according to the obligations of religion, and towards defending Hindustan itself against the effect of French machinations. Should it be true, as we hear, that an intimate connection has taken place between your Court and that nation, we hope that, by weighing present cir-

cumstances as well as every future inconvenience which would result from such a measure, your Majesty will beware against it ; and in the event of your having harboured any idea of joining with them, or of moving against Great Britain, you will lay such resolution aside. We make it our especial request that your Majesty will please to refrain from entering into any measures against the English, or lending any complaint ear to the French. Should there exist any subject of complaint with the former, please to communicate it ; certain as you may be of the employment of every good office on our side to compromise the same. We wish to see the connection above alluded to be exchanged in favour of Great Britain.

We confidently expect that, upon consideration of all that is stated in this communication, and of the necessity of assisting your brethren Mussulmans in this general cause of Religion, as well as of co-operating towards the above precious province being delivered from the hands of the enemy, your Majesty will employ every means which your natural zeal will point out to assist the common cause and to corroborate, by that means, the ancient good understanding so happily existing between our Empires.

Certified Translation and Copy,

(Sd.) SPENCER SMITH.

A true Copy,

(Sd.) J. A. GRANT,

A true Copy,

Sub-Secretary.

(Sd.) N. B. EDMONSTONE,

P. T. to the Government.

FROM TIPPOO SULTAUN.

Dt. 10th, Ramzaun, 1213 (answering to
February 16, 1799).

Received April 3, 1799.

A Letter, in reply to the gracious letter of the Sublime Porte (titles omitted) addressed to me, which reached you through the British Envoy, and which you transmitted to me, is sent—let it be forwarded to Constantinople, by the road it came by. A copy of my answer is enclosed for your perusal. Always continue to gratify me by letters notifying your welfare. What more need I write?

Translation of Enclosures, in the letter from Tippoo Sultaun to the Right Honourable the Governor-General dated 10th Ramzaun, or 16th February, 1799. Received at Fort St. George, 3rd April.

Copy of Tippoo Sultaun's Reply to the Letter addressed to him by the Grand Seignior.

In the Name of the Most Merciful God!

Praise to the Supreme King of Kings, who hath made just and high-minded princes the instruments for exalting the standard of the established religion of Mohummed, and committed the governance and prosperity of the people and dominions of Islam to their able management and guidance! Be abundance of praises also the offering at the throne of that Leader, by the aid of whose prophetic mission the benignant channels of Faith retain their course and salutations unnumbered to that consecrated Person

whose Divine Mission is the pride of the followers of Islam, and to his illustrious offspring and companions ; every one of whom was the extirpator of Heretics, and of those who know not the way of the Lord ! After this, it is humbly represented to the exalted Presence the Seat of Justice, expanded as the Heavens, resplendent as the Sun ; to the luminous Star of the Firmament of Dominion ; the bright Planet of the Empyreum of Glory and good Fortune ; the Bloom of the Bower of Greatness ; the Refresher of the Spring of Supremacy ; the Ornament of the Throne of Pomp and Splendour ; the Support of the Seat of Happiness and Prosperity—with troops numerous as the Stars ; with Angels his guards ; whose throne is exalted as the Skies ; whose dignity is as Solomon's ; the Ray of the Benignity of God, the Sultaun of the Sea and Land, may the Vessels of his State continue to traverse the Seas of Success and Prosperity, unperishable ! And may the Effects of his Justice continue to pervade every Corner of the Faith ! The August and Gracious Letter written the 11th of Rebbeeh-oo-Sauny 1913 Hijri (answering to 23rd September, 1798) which was issued through the British Envoy, conveyed upon me boundless Honour and Distinction ; the Foundations of Concord and Attachment acquired new Strength from its Contents, and the Fabric of Friendship obtained renovated Firmness by the Gracious Expressions it contains.

The venerated pen did me honour to write of the irruption of the French Nation, those objects of

the Divine Anger, by the utmost treachery and deceit, into the venerated region of Egypt, notwithstanding the strict observance of long subsisting amity and friendship on the part of the Sublime Porte. Of the views of that irreligious, turbulent People—of their denial of God and His Prophets—of the determination of the Sublime Porte to adopt the most vigorous measures for the overthrow of that Nation of Rebels and desiring me, for the sake of the whole Body of the Faith and Religious Brotherhood, to afford assistance to our Brethren Mussulmans ; support our Holy Theology, and not withhold my power and endeavours in defending the Region of Hindustan from the machinations and evil of these enemies—that I will explain to the Sublime Porte, whatever ground of uneasiness and complaint the English may have given me, when by the Divine Aid and the intervention of your good offices, all differences will be compromised, and opposition and estrangement be converted into cordiality and union. This Gracious Communication I have understood.

Through the Divine Favour and Prophetic Grace, all the Votaries of Islam are united in Brotherhood by the ties of Religion. Especially the Sublime Porte and this State, the Good Gift of God ; for the foundations of friendship and attachment are firmly cemented between them, and repeated tokens of mutual regard have been manifested. Both in word and deed are they aiding and assisting to each other. This Labourer in the way of the Lord I am obedient

to your Highness's world-subjecting will. There is absolutely no difference between us. Let me be informed of, and employed to promote, that which your exalted mind proposes for the prosperity and due ordinance of the Faith and its Followers, and the aid of God will alone ensure success. As the French nation are estranged from, and are become the opponents of the Sūblime Porte, they may be said to have rendered themselves the enemy of all the Followers of the Faith, all Mussulmans should renounce friendship with them. (Quotation from the Koran). I confidently hope that the gates of friendly correspondence between the two States may be always open, and the sentiments of our friendly minds be disclosed to each other. May the Sun of Dominion and Prosperity be resplendent in the East of Greatness !

Dated the 10th Ramzaun the blessed, 1213 Hedgiree
(answering to 16th February, 1799).

True Translation.

(Sd.) N. B. EDMONSTONE,

P. T. to the Government.

LOYALTY OF INDIA TO OTTOMAN KHALIFAS

So long as the Khilafat was at Bagdad all the dynasties of India remained loyal and dutiful to it. They regarded it great honour and distinction to render allegiance and submission even to the nominal

Abbaside Khalifas of Egypt which was founded in 668 A. H. after the downfall of the Khilafat at Bagdad. They were compelled by the reverence due to the Central Government according to the dictate of religion to obtain a certificate for their amarat (kingship) from the seat of Khilafat recognising them to be lawful sovereigns.

The opinion that the belief in the Khilafat of the Ottoman Sultans among the Muslims of India is a creation of modern times (as Sir Valentine Chirol asserts) is wholly devoid of truth.

After the conquest of Egypt in the 16th century, Sultan Selim Khan became not only the visible chief of the Muslim state throughout the wide dominion subdued to his sway, but also the revered head of the religion of Islam. The Shias of Persia, says Lane-poole, might reject his claim, but in India, in all parts of Asia, and Africa, where the traditional Khilafat was recognised, the Ottoman Sultan henceforth was the supreme head of the church, the successor of the spiritual prestige of the long line of Khalifas. There can be no doubt, goes on the learned historian, that it has always added, and still adds a real and important authority to the acts and proclamations of the Ottoman Sultan. Such is the testimony of a well known English historian. Even in the early 16th century Sultan's claim to the Khilafat was recognised by the rulers of Guzrat, the Musalmans of China, Ceylon, Islands of Samatra, Java, and the Malay Peninsula. The Musalmans of

India have all along recognised the Sultan of Turkey as Khalifas.

The control of the Ottoman Sultans over the central Khilafat of India is a fact which has always been known to and held as part of faith by the Ulama of India. Hazrat Shah Waliullah died in 1734 A.D. The invasion and return of Ahmad Shah Abdali took place in his time. He has mentioned the Sultans of Turkey in two places in his famous book "*Tafhimatul Ahya*. In one of these he says:—"From the time of Sultan Selim Khan who lived in the beginning of the thousandth year of Hijra, most of the countries of Arabia, Egypt and Syria have been under the control of the Turkish Sultans, on whom has devolved—the wardenship of the two sacred Harems (may God enhance their glory and reverence), Chieftainship of the Mausam gathering and of Haj, and the arrangement of Mahmil and the caravans. For this reason every one of them is remembered as the Ameerul-Momenin—Commander of the Faithful—on the pulpits of Arabia and Syria etc. in general and on those of the two sacred harems in particular."

European nations themselves and especially the British government have always recognised the Khalifa. They have made use of this power of the Sultan of Turkey for their own purposes. The *firman* obtained from Sultan Abdul Hamid Khan during the Sepoy Mutiny of 1857 A.D. advising the Musalmans to act loyally towards the British government was based on the assumption that the Sultan

of Turkey had a right to command and guide the Musalmans as the Khalifa of Islam. During the reign of Queen Victoria the question of Hajees was frequently raised by the government of India and brought by the British Government to the notice of the Sultan of Turkey that it was His Majesty's religious duty to remove them as the Khalifa of Islam. France and Russia have made similar professions on several occasions in the reign of Sultan Abdul Hamid. In recent years the independent ruler of the Afghans Amir Abdur Rahman, has recognised the Sultan Abdul Hamid as Khalifa and received at his hands the confirmation of the title of Sirajul-Millat-Wad-Din.

EUROPE AND THE TURKS.

Mawlana Abul Kalam Azad the Great Muslim *savant*, rightly observes that among all the ruling Moslem nations, the Turk cannot expect justice and impartiality from a European mind. Be it a European historian or a statesman of the present age, he can eulogise the worst Musalmans who are dead but he cannot open his mouth in praise of the Turks whose defensive swords have been living for five centuries to be thrust into the heart of Europe. He can compile a good history of the Omayyads and sing the praise of the age of learning and civilisation under the Abbasides, he can even worship Salahuddin Ayyubi (as an idol) whose noble sword opposed

the united forces of European Christendom during the Crusades in Syria and Palestine, but he cannot act justly towards the Turks who, as he would think, not being content with Arabia, Persia, Iraq, Syria, or Palestine advanced towards Europe and captured the very heart of that continent *viz.*, Constantinople and who further rushed into the interior populations like a flood from the ocean, to the extent that more than once the very walls of the capital of Austria were shaken. This is an offence which Europe can never forgive. No other ruling dynasty of Musalmans took part in the commissions of this guilt (the conquest of Europe) and therefore every Muslim ruler who could not divert his attention towards Europe was good. But the Turk is denounced as an uncouth barbarian because his sword has dispelled the magic of Europe. What stronger proofs can be required of the just and tolerant rule of the Turks continuing for five centuries than that the subject Christian races have remained compact political and religious bodies and strong enough to be raised to independence at once with the decline of Turkey—a capacity which they could never have acquired under Christian control. On the contrary, in India, under the British Government which is not yet a century old, people have lost even that regard for national dignity and solidarity with which their ancestors ruled over this land 70 years ago. This alone is enough to distinguish clearly between the methods of European Government and those of the

Turks. The Turks cannot even imagine the horrors atrocities, brutalities, national prejudices, and hatred which the arrogant idolators of Europe have perpetrated in Asia and Africa in these 19th and 20th centuries in broad day-light. The whole history of not only the Turks but also of Asia cannot present a parallel to the horrible and shameful barbarity which one nation of Europe tore another. And yet the Turks are uncouth barbarians, and Europeans are civilised, cultured and harbingers of peace and security !

The Turks may have misruled, their administration may have been worse than the vilest of Banu Umayya, but the Muslims have been commanded to be loyal to their Ameers under almost all circumstances. It is their religious conviction that the Ottoman Sultan is the Khalifa of the Moslem world and none has a right to interfere with their conscience.

MR. BLUNT ON THE OTTOMAN KHALIFAS.

Mr. W. S. Blunt in his 'Future of Islam' puts forward the following arguments in support of the present Ottoman Khalifas :—

1. *THE RIGHT OF THE SWORD.*

The Khilafat being a necessary (and this all Muslim admit), it was also a necessity that the *de facto* holder of the title should be recognised

until a claimant with a better claim should appear. Now the first qualification of a claimant was that he should make the claim, and the second, that he should be supported by a party ; and Salim had both claimed the khilafat and supported his pretensions at the head of an army. He challenged the world to produce a rival, and no rival had been found.

2. ELECTION :—

That is, the sanction of a legal body of elders. It was argued that, as the *ahlu aqd* (or council), had been removed from Al-Madinah to Damascus, and from Damascus to Baghdad and from Baghdad to Cairo, so it had been once more legally removed from Cairo to Constantinople. Salim I had brought with him Aiya Sofia's some of the Ulama (learned men) in Cairo, and these in conjunction with the Turkish Ulama had elected him or ratified his election. A form of election is to the present day observed at Constantinople in token of this right and each new Khalifa-Sultan—of the house of Usman, as he succeeds to the temporal sovereignty of Turkey, must wait before being recognised as Khalifa till he had received the sword of office at the hands of the Ulama. This ceremony it is customary to perform in the mosque of Aiyub.

3. NOMINATION :—

Sultan Salim, as has been already said, obtained from Mutawakkil, a descendant of the Abbasides,

and himself a Khalif, a full cession of all the Khalifa rights of that family. The fact, as far as it goes, is historical and the only flaw in the argument would seem to be that Mutawakkil had no right thus to dispose of a title to an alien, which was his own only in virtue of his birth. As a precedent for nomination, they cite the act of Abu Bakr, who on his death-bed, recommended Umar as his successor in the Khilafat.

4. *THE GUARDENSHIP OF THE TWO SHRINES (HARAMAN):—*

That is to say of Mekkah, Medina and Jerusalem, but specially of Mekkah. It has been asserted by some of the Ulama and it is certainly a common opinion at the present day, that the sovereignty of Jaziratul Arab (Peninsula of Arabia) is in itself sufficient title to the Khilafat. It seems certainly to have been so considered in the first age of Islam, and many war was then fought for the right of protecting Mekkah.—Baitul'lah.

MR. MARMADUKE PIKTHALL ON THE STATUS OF THE KHALIFA.

The so-called separation of the temporal power from the Khilafat by a decree of the Grand National Assembly of Turkey came as a shock to most people in India—Muslims and non-Muslims alike—but it would not have come as a shock to Muslims if it

had been stated in terms of Islamic instead of Christian ideology ; and the Muslims quickly realised that there was something queer about the news as telegraphed by Reuter's agency, and that the Turks could not possibly have done exactly what they were reported to have done—i.e., relegated the Khalifa of the Muslims to the present status of the Pope of Rome. In Christian ideas, religion is apart from politics ; it is not so in Islam ; therefore the religious head of Islam must be the political head. The Pope of Rome is the head of a highly organised and influential clergy, which commands the superstitious reverence of devotees of that religion ; in that way he undoubtedly has considerable political influence ; but in Islam there is no such thing as an organised clergy and no superstitious awe attaches even to the person of the Khalifa ; therefore to make the Khalifa's status the same as that of the Pope of Rome, *mutatis mutandis*, would be to reduce the Prince of Believers veritably to a shadow—a thing the Turks are very far from contemplating.

Being familiar with the ideas upon the subject of reform which have of recent years been occupying the best brains in Turkey and the Arabic-speaking countries, I can perhaps explain the enigma of this action of the Turkish patriots. In the first place I must ask the reader to rid his mind of the entirely wrong idea that the Ottoman Turks are warriors and nothing else. They are *the political*

race par excellence. They have a positive genius for the art of Government, and generally have much larger views than we observe in European statesmen of the present day. They are a race of very lucid thinkers, whose voluminous and interesting modern literature abounds in highly stimulating, bold ideas. They are confronted not only with the problem of saving what remains of their country, but also with the problem of consolidating the whole Islamic world, not for aggressive purposes, but for defence. The Khilafat is essentially the institution which should hold the Muslim world together as one family ; but it has not done so now for many centuries. Why? Because it had become identified completely with the temporal power, the pride and the ambition of the Turkish State. The Sultanate and the system it comported had become abhorrent to the Turkish nation. It had been used, and might again be used, against them by the enemies of Turkey. The system was oppressive, wasteful and corrupt. With one stroke of the pen they have got rid of it. But the Khilafat is a very different matter. It is essential to the whole Islamic system, and, unlike the Sultanate, more essential in revival than in decadence. It must be no longer a mere political weapon in the hand of the ruler of the Turkish State, but a living, independent institution free to function for the good of every Muslim land as well as Turkey. It is, thus, a mistake to say that the Turks have taken temporal power away from the Khilafat. It

would be more correct to say that they have separated the temporal power of the Khilafat from the temporal power of the Turkish State. Knowing the immense pains which have been taken by learned men to ascertain the proper status, rights and functions of the Khilafat as it existed in early days, with a view to restore the institution in its purity, we are amused at the suggestion from some quarters that the Turks are seeking to destroy the institution of Khilafat by robbing it of all authority.

What the Turks are aiming at is the reverse of that. They, as the acknowledged champions of Islam to-day, are the defenders of the person of the Khalifa, even as Qureysh and the Ansar were defenders of the persons of the first Khalifas in Medina, but the Khalifa is not for that reason their Khalifa any more than he is the Khalifa of the Arabs or the Afghans or the Sudanese. So far as the Turkish students of Islamic history have been able to make out the position of the first four "rightly guided" Khalifas in relation to the polity in which they lived and to the Muslim brotherhood, that is the position of the new Khalifa of the House of Osman.

It is a reform which has immense potentialities for, if Islam has not for centuries conveyed its message to the world—a message of human brotherhood and toleration, well worth all men's while to hear—that is mainly because the Khilafat, which should be the missionary head of the religion, has

been identified entirely with the aspirations and vicissitudes and involved in the misfortunes of one Muslim Power. Politically also it adds strength to Islam, for, as Ismet Pasha told the *Bombay Chronicle's* correspondent at Lausanne, it enables the Turks to stand up for the Khalifa's rights over the Holy Places of Islam without incurring the suspicion of assailing Arab nationalism, on the one hand, or of trying to regain their empire on the other.

There is nothing narrow or self-seeking, much less anti-human in the ideas which now inspire the Turkish people, and will soon inspire the whole Islamic world. Europe would welcome and encourage them with all her might if she preferred the welfare of the human race before her own supremacy. It is really pitiful to see the Allies at Lausanne manœuvring for mean advantages for "Christian" proteges of theirs, when a show of real goodwill towards Turkey at this moment would relieve the fearful tension of the East. Oh, for a statesman, who was neither a cynic nor a Wee Free, but just an honest, understanding man of world-wide sympathy !

TURKEY AND THE KHILAFAT.

AN ENGLISH JUDGE'S TESTIMONY.

Mr. Arthur H. Hardomge says :—I am very reluctant to seem to differ from so eminent an Orientalist as Professor Margoliouth, but as an old

official, who has spent the best part of twenty years in Muslim countries, and has sat as a judge in a Court administering Muslim law, mainly that of the Shafei school, I do not think that he does full justice to the Ottoman claim to the Khilafat. The Sultan's claim to be the Vicar of the Prophet as successor of Abu Bekr, and the Pope's to be Vicar of Christ as successor of St. Peter, are contested by many Mahomedans in the one case, as by many Christians in the other, and if a poll of Islam and of Christendom could be taken, the supporters of both claims would probably be found to be in a minority, though the majority against them would be made up of very different bodies, at issue with one another on many other religious questions.

It would include, for instance, the Shiahs of all descriptions, who execrate all the early Khalifs except Ali and his sons, the Malekite Sunnis of Morocco, who have their own Idrisite Commander of the Faithful, and the Puritan sects old and new, such as the Wahhabis of Nejd, the North African "Senoussiyeh," and the Khareji Ibadhis of Oman and Zanzibar, who seem to hold that every chief of a self-governing Muslim community or even family is its natural Imam, or religious guide, so long as his own life and faith are pure. But it would now, I believe, be accepted by all the Osmanli Turks, by the Sunni Arabs of the "Hanefi" school, and by most of those of the "Maleki," "Shafei," and "Hanbali" schools, in the old Turkish Empire ; and by most

Sunni Mussulmans in Russia, China, and Tartary, including the Khanates of Central Asia, whence the Mogul conquerors brought their own Hanefite form of Islam into India, as well as in Java and among our South African Malays, though on the latter point I feel uncertain.

Its advocates—and I have often discussed the question with Muslim ecclesiastics—are not convinced by the argument that the Sultaun is not a member of the sacred tribe of the Koreish. Their view is that his ancestor Selim I became one spiritually through his adoption—a very potent factor in the East—as his heir and successor, by the last phantom Abbasid Khalif of Egypt—Mutewakkil Ullah was, I think, his name—who solemnly transferred to him the insignia and other relics of the Prophet—now in the mosque of Eyub at Constantinople—just as a Christian bishop receives from his consecrators the episcopal vestments and the Bible. It is, they say, a Shiah heresy to contend that these spiritual attributes can be derived only from material hereditary descent, the exclusion of Ali in favour of the first three Khalifs, and of his descendants by the Beni Omeyyiah, and afterwards by those of the Prophet's uncle Abbas, is a clear proof that a spiritual office cannot be a matter of indefeasible hereditary right, nor of caste, against which the whole spirit of Islam is a protest. This view is, after all, not unlike that of St. Paul, where he says that a man cannot boast of being a Jew, because he is one “outwardly” or after the flesh, and

illustrates the inferiority of the hereditary Jewish to the spiritual Christian priesthood by the argument that Levi paid tithes through Abraham to Melchisedek.

I could not say much on another aspect of the question, the pain which many good Mahomedans, loyal subjects of our Crown would undoubtedly feel at the loss by Turkey of the "lordship of the two continents and seas," Rum and Anadol, the Euxine and the Mediterranean, which were long regarded by many as an indirect attribute and evidence of the Ottoman question, and might try the patience of the readers.

PROFESSOR NALLINO ANSWERED.

Mawlana Syed Sulaiman Nadwi says :—

I was surprised to read in a recent issue of the "Morning Post," under the heading "The Sultan as Caliph," excerpts from a pamphlet entitled "The Nature of the Caliphate," purporting to have emanated from the pen of Professor Nallino, of the University of Rome, and published by the Italian Foreign Office. Professor Nallino is an Orientalist of some repute and occupies the chair of the History and Institutions of Islam. It is, therefore, all the more regrettable that a scholar of such repute should betray such profound ignorance on a subject which is his special study, nor does it reflect much credit on the Italian Foreign Office to have published the pamphlet under the authority of the State when

better and more reliable sources of information were available to it.

No contention could be farther from fact than Professor Nallino's thesis that "Sunnite Islamism has never admitted a supreme head of the Islamic Church." This is against recorded history and I would refer the professor to the chapters on Imarat (Amirate) in books of holy traditions and to chapters on Imamat in books on the Islamic articles of faith to revise his views on the point. The only difference between the Shiahs and the Sunnis on this question is that while the Shiahs consider descent from the Prophet essential for any valid claim to Imamate, the Sunnis do not subscribe to this view. But both equally believe in and admit a supreme head of the Islamic Church. Allama Nasfi, Imam Razi, Qazi Uzud, among other eminent authorities, deal with this subject exhaustively in their books and should be considered final authorities on the point. An authentic tradition of the Prophet in Sahih Muslim explicitly declares that if a Mussulman dies without acknowledging the Imam of his time he dies the death of a kafir (infidel). Can the eminent professor seriously maintain his thesis in the face of this explicit and authoritative declaration of the holy Prophet and advise the Mussulmans to live a kafir's life and die a kafir's death? It is true that, unlike the Catholics and the Shiahs, the Sunnis do not attribute infallibility to their Imam, but there is a world of difference between this and the con-

tention that "Sunnite Islamism has never admitted a supreme head of the Church."

Equally untenable and contrary to facts is the contention that "the Caliphate died out definitively in A.D. 1258, when the Tartars sacked Baghdad, putting an end to the Caliphate of the Abbasides." It is true that Baghdad ceased to exist as the centre of the Khilafat after its sack in 1528, but the Khilafat itself continued, only it shifted to a new centre in Egypt, where it wielded power until the conquest of that country by the Turks. If Professor Nallino takes the trouble of reading Jalaluddin's Suyuti's authoritative and easily accessible book, "History of the Caliphs," he will find a faithful and connected record of the events of the reigns of every Khalifa down to the time of the author himself. The last Khalifa of this line was Al-Mutawakkil who took his abode in Constantinople (A. H. 918) in A.D. 1518, when Egypt passed into the hands of the Ottoman Sultan Selim, to whom he handed all the symbols of the Khilafat and the sacred relics. After him Sultan Selim was raised to the dignity of the Khalifa without opposition from any part of the Muslim world. Since then every Friday the names of the Sultans of Turkey are most reverently read from every mosque and pulpit in the Islamic world to the faithful assembled for Friday prayers.

If Professor Nallino goes to India and visits any mosque right from the grand mosque of the metropolis of the Indian Empire down to the humblest

mosque in the most obscure corner of that vast country, he can verify the statement for himself. The practice is not confined to India alone. What is true of India is true of the whole Muslim world. On its way to England our delegation had occasion to witness the intensity of Muslim feeling on the point in the Italian colony of Eritrea. When our ship touched at Mossowa, and local Mussulmans, including Government and police officers, under the very eyes of their superiors, immediately on the knowledge of the mission on which we were coming, spontaneously burst into a rousing prayer for the success of the delegation and the preservation and victory of the Sultan-Khalifa. Surely this should be sufficient to soothe the professor's scepticism.

Works of Muslim authors and the question of Muslim practice apart, the professor would not have fallen into the error of terminating the Khilafat in A.D. 1258 had he taken the trouble even to consult the work of a Christian author. I refer to the "Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi," by Edward Thomas. He will there find that not only till A.D. 1258, but even as far as A.D. 1530, all the coins of the Mussulman kings of India bore the name and title of the Khalifa in acknowledgment of his overlordship of Islam. The fact is that, not only did Muslims acknowledge the spiritual supremacy of the Khalifa, but no Muslim ruler, as a rule, had any pretensions to anything higher than power vicariously exercised on behalf of the Khalifa. If

the practice suffered a temporary eclipse in India during the reign of Akbar, the reason is obvious. It was because Akbar had the ambition to storm the sacred precincts of Almighty God himself and to arrogate to himself the attribute of divinity. And this is responsible for the disapprobation of the Mussulmans of India which he incurred, in spite of the many undoubted blessings which his rule conferred on India.

More recent and crucial instances in which the authority of the Khalifas, as recognised heads of the Islamic polity and—what is still more significant—the authority of the Sultans of Turkey as Khalifas, was recognised are the wars of the East India Company against Sultan Tippu and the mutiny of 1857. A reference to the records of the time shows that not only did the Mussulmans recognise the Ottoman Sultan as Khalifah, but the British themselves recognised the fact and tried to mobilise the Khalifa's powers for their own benefit. In this connection a reference to the *Karnami Hydari*, a work quoted also in the monograph on Cornwallis in the *Rulers of India* series.

But it is not, I believe, that the professor has not come across these historical facts, for he does refer to some of them. Only he designates them as "deliberate tricks" and "mistakes." My reply to that is that if they are deliberate tricks and mistakes, they are tricks and mistakes which the Mussulmans have consistently and without inter-

ruption perpetrated throughout their long history of thirteen hundred years and more. And, after all, they should be the final authority on matters concerning their religion.

PART II.

INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION IN EUROPE

MISSION OF THE INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION.

BY SYUD HOSSAIN.

The Indian Khilafat Delegation, which arrived in London last week, and which was received by the Right Hon. H. A. L. Fisher on behalf of the Secretary of State for India on Tuesday last, is charged with a mission whose aims and object it is important should be made known to, and clearly realised by, the people of the United Kingdom. In due course we hope to put our case before the Prime Minister himself and the Peace Conference, but it is not less essential that it should also be placed, fully and frankly, before the British public and Parliament.

The issue which has brought us to this country is a grave one, but before I refer to it may be useful to add a word in regard to our credentials. The Delegation has been sent by the All-India Khilafat Conference, probably the most representative body of its kind that has ever been constituted in India to deal with a public question. It includes not only the leading Mussalmans of India, irrespective of

party and sect, but the foremost leaders of the Hindu community as well, such as Mr. M. K. Gandhi, the Hon. Pandit M. M. Malaviya, the Hon. Pandit Motilal Nehru, President of the Indian National Congress, and Mr. B. G. Tilak—a remarkable manifestation of the solidarity of Hindu-Muslim unity which has been achieved in recent years. The Khilafat question, therefore, is not merely a Muslim but an Indian question, and the Hindus have identified themselves with the Muslim cause because they realise that it is a matter of life and death to the seventy millions of their Muslim compatriots.

Khalifa as Temporal Power.

The Mussulmans of India are primarily interested in the Turkish settlement because the Sultan of Turkey is the Khalifa of Islam and the warden of its Holy Shrines. It is of the essence of the institution of the Khilafat—whose history is co-extensive with the history of Islam—that the Khalifa should be an independent temporal sovereign before he can be the spiritual head of the Muslim world. Amir-ul-Momenin—"Commander of the Faithful"—is the formal designation of the Khalifa, and the role postulates the capacity and strength to be a Defender of the Faith. This qualification, it should be noted, is not a matter of sentiment or theory, but an indefeasible obligation imposed by solemn religious injunction. It follows, therefore, that

dismemberment of the Empire of the Khalifa involves the disintegration of the Khilafat: the Sultan of Turkey cannot be both a temporal figure-head and Khalifa of Islam. What the Muslim world desires, therefore, is that the fabric of the Ottoman Empire—of the Khilafat shall be maintained intact, on the basis of the territorial, though not necessarily the political, *status quo ante bellum*. This means that while there is not the slightest objection to any homogeneous community, whether Muslim or Non-Muslim, which forms part of the Turkish Empire, being assured, in the words of President Wilson, "an absolutely unmolested self-determination" should be worked out within a scheme of Ottoman Empire.

"Solemn Pledges."

We believe this can be done if a bona fide attempt is made to apply the principles set forth in President Wilson's twelfth point, on the basis of which the Armistice with Turkey was signed, and the pledges given to the Muslim world by Mr. Lloyd George in his speech of January 5, 1918, when he declared as he himself claimed, "not merely the mind of the Government, but of the nation and the Empire as a whole." I would ask my readers to refer to the terms of these two pronouncements; the Muslim case is nothing more, and nothing less, than a demand for the fulfilment of the solemn pledges contained therein and in the Proclamation

issued by Lord Hardinge as Viceroy of India—pledges which induced tens of thousands of Indian Mussalmans to give their lives in the late war in defence of England and the Empire. If the pledges to which I refer are now redeemed, in the spirit in which they were given and accepted, the inviolability of Jazirat-ul-Arab—the “Island of Arabia” as delimited by Muslim religious authorities, in which are situated the cities and the shrines consecrated by the imperishable religious traditions and historical associations of the Mussulmans, and which have never been in other than Muslim control during the 1,400 years of Islamic history—would be secured. That is a cardinal requirement of Islamic religious existence, which no Muslim, consistently with the obligations of his faith, may surrender or minimise—Mr. Syad Hossain in “Observer,” March 7, 1920, London.

THE KHILAFAT DELEGATION.

INTERVIEW WITH MR. MOHAMED ALI.

“The Turk should be judged before sentence is passed upon him,” was the incisive opening statement of Mr. Mohamed Ali, the leader of the Indian Khilafat Deputation, to my request for a statement of the objects of his mission. “Europe and Christendom have been one huge Star Chamber so faras the Turks are concerned, with not even the

judicial ermine to distinguish between prosecutor, the judge, and the accused. The Turk has been condemned absolutely unheard."

"But have not many Europeans who have fought the Turk given him a good character as a clean and honourable fighter?" I queried.

"Yes—those who actually fought against the Turk, it is not they who condemn the Turk, but the man who has been a stay-at-home, whose feelings have been wrought upon by two of the shrewdest communities upon the earth—the Greeks and the Armenians. We challenge all open relevant enquiries."

"Lord Bryce has recently criticised the Muslims of India for uttering no word of condemnation of the undoubted Armenian massacres. What comment have you to make upon that?"

"I would say that to Lord Bryce they are undoubted. The moment that they are undoubted to us we should heartily condemn them. Islam is dearer to us than are the Turks. If there have been Armenian massacres we should try to find out who has tried to stir them up, to find out whoever is interested that there should be misrule and what provocation has first been given to that peasant community of Turkish blood—a community not very nimble-witted, yet who have to deal with an Armenian community which insists on having its pound of flesh in every business transaction. If such a measure could be passed to restrain Armenian

exploitation, as the Land Allienation Bill which restrains the Indian bania there might be a greater outcry than there is even over the massacres! The Armenians are a commercial minority living upon the backs of the majority. The majority are people of elemental passions who see red because they are exploited. They have no access to the Chancelleries of Europe nor to historians like Lord Bryce." "But if," continued Mr. Mahomed Ali, "the Trade Unions of Britain realised that the Turks were the workers of Asia who were fighting against their alien capitalists, they might re-adjust some of their views."

"What have you to say upon the recent reports of fresh massacres?" I asked.

"That they want to take Smyrna from the Turk as a capitalist move. The massacres in Cilicia are suitable both in time and place to promote such a result. Hence we should suspend judgment until we know more of the matter."

"What is your opinion as to the freedom of the Straits?"

"It is vitally connected with the freedom of the seas. Great Britain has her reservations upon that subject, and Mussulmans their own upon the smaller one. Do not create new heavens and new earths as microcosms in small places. If you apply a formula, apply it all round. There has been an interesting reversal as to the policy of the opening of the Straits. Russia fought for it in the Crimean War; France and England opposed it, and the Peace of

Paris of 1863 contained a clause Prohibiting the Black Sea Fleet of Russia from passing the Dardanelles. To-day Tsarist Russia is no longer to be feared, so why do we hear so much about the opening of the Straits and the British guns which are to command them? Russia has changed hands, but evidently Lenin and Trotsky are to be outflanked in the Black Sea ; it is really that the Mediterranean Fleet wants to go in. The command of that part of the world is a question of oil. Otherwise there never was any necessity to go to Bagdad."

"Do you believe in self-determination for Asia Minor?"

"Yes, if it be granted for Asia Major, and India be granted complete self-government."

"What is your opinion as to the defence of India against aggression by the acquisition of Muslim States?"

"That India should be consulted about the defence of India. If Turkey were to attack India, Indian Muslims would defend her. Islam sanctions war only in defence of Islam. After all, why has there been in no previous war any talk of the safety of the Khilafat? Because never before was it in jeopardy. It is all very well for the 'Methodist Recorder' to talk about taking the mind of Jesus Christ to the Turk ; by all means do so, but not by British troops occupying the Straits. *It is not Christianity but infidelity which the Muslim dreads.* The claim for Constantinople, therefore, rests upon the

belief that there should be some places devoted to the worship of the One God—where a man claims obedience through God and for God, and not for Mammon, commerce, strategic frontiers, bourses, oil, imperial expansion, or the exploration of the native."

"What are your Deputation's specific spiritual and territorial claims?" I asked.

"They are three. First, that it is a question purely between Mussulman and Mussulman that the Holy Places of Islam must remain with the Khalif. We want no puppets of the Hedjaz to be their custodians. Even in the Hedjaz a fair plebiscite would give as a result that the strongest Muslim Power ought to be the custodian.

"The second demand concerns the 'Island' of Arabia. By the testament of the Prophet it ought to be under the exclusive right of the Khalif. That the 'fourth boundary' of the Tigris and Euphrates (including Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine) must be in Muslim control is an injunction behind which no Mussulman can go. This was the Land of the Prophets ; there is no material wealth there to tempt cupidity ; it has a barren soil ; Mecca, where Abraham settled his son Ishmael, was the centre of the 'uncultivable valley,' Mecca itself being designated by God as 'the protected city.' It is the great sanctuary of the Faithful. Its personal centre is the Khalif, the Commander of the Faithful. If all the world slip away, the 'island' is sacrosanct. Its

sovereignty is God's and God's alone. From that land the Khalif drew no soldiers and no money. More was spent on Arabia than came out of it. It was not a question of gain but of responsibility. As to Jerusalem, who could be a better warden than the Turk? He was practically there to keep peace among the Christians, and between the Jews and the Christians. In fact, the Jews of Palestine would be just as willing to live under Turkish suzerainty as British, if there was assurance of their development. With regard to all the allegations, against the Young Turks, they have never been given a dog's chance. You would not find a Muslim in India to say a word against the Young Turks. The difficulty to-day was that there was no access between Turkey and India. I myself," said Mr. Mahomed Ali, "was interned on the ground that I had sympathy with the King's enemies. As a matter of fact, the wire I sent to Talaat was sent from Simla with Government money, and was written in the office of the head of the C.I.D. Roughly speaking, it ran as follows:—

"Please think a thousand times before you enter this war, and if you enter this war against England our position would be extremely sad."

"Instead of interning us, the Government should have used us as ambassadors to influence Turkey to check her, to keep her out of this war. But Russia would never have allowed that! Russia

has gone. India may go, for all that Englishmen seem to care.

“Our third claim is that the preservation of the Khilafat for the defence of the Faith postulates adequate territory, adequate military and naval resources, adequate financial resources, adequate room for industrial and economic development. If, for instance, Thrace, Smyrna, and Cicilia be torn away, Turkey loses her industrial and economic centres. If that is to be done, as a counsel of despair one might say, ‘Take away Constantinople.’ At least that would satisfy the new owner. But the pledges of Mr. Lloyd George for Thrace and Asia Minor ought to cover these last claims”—“India,” March 12.

INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION.

OFFICIAL RECEPTION AT THE INDIA OFFICE.

The Indian Khilafat Delegation were received by Mr. Fisher (on behalf of Mr. Montagu, Secretary of State for India) March 2, 1920. The Delegation consisted of Mr. Mohamed Ali, Mr. Syud Hossain, Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nadvi, and Mr. Mohamed Hayat, secretary.

There were also present from the India office Sir William Duke, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I., Mr. J. E. Shuckburgh, C.B., and Mr. S. K. Brown.

Mr. Mohamed Ali: I think, Sir, it is probably

understood by the Secretary of State that we held at Amritsar a session of the All-India Khilafat Conference during the early part of this year, when a resolution was passed for a second time, that a Delegation should proceed to Europe and America, in the first instance, to lay before His Majesty's Government and the Allies, and, of course, the Peace Conference, the point of view of the Mussulmans generally, explaining their religious obligations and sentiments, and the position of Indian Mussulmans, and also making clear to His Majesty's Government the support that Mussulmans are receiving in this matter from the vast bulk of Indian opinion.

With regard to this matter, we did not at the time know when precisely the Peace Conference would commence making a settlement with the Turks, and the Viceroy in his reply to our address even expressed the fear that we might arrive too late to be heard before the final settlement. We trust that is not the case, and we wired to the Secretary of State for India and to the Prime Minister immediately on landing at Venice on February 22, urging that we should be given a full and fair hearing before any decisions were taken. We are now here, and are thankful for being received by you this evening on behalf of Mr. Montagu, about whose illness we are very sorry to hear.

Before we enter into any explanation of our

religious obligations and views, I should like to say that on our arrival here, and even in the course of our journey across Europe, we found that a certain kind of propaganda was being carried on by the Armenians and the Greeks and others hostile to Turkey, who have been accusing the Turks of most horrible and revolting crimes. We for our part are, to speak quite frankly, not in a position to work in the same manner here, because, in the first place, we can afford neither the money nor the morals for such a propaganda ; and, in the next place, because we are not at all in touch with the Turks, who are after all, the principal people concerned in the matter ; consequently we cannot verify any accusations, however grave. But we note that in the last session of the All-India Khilafat Conference, held at Bombay on February 15 and 16, a resolution was passed to the effect that a Delegation of Indian Mussulmans should proceed to Asia Minor as well as to other regions in the Empire of the Khilafat, When this Delegation have visited the parts from which massacres are being reported at this critical moment, we shall be in a position to affirm or to deny the truth of these reports.

But our position is, above all, of a religious character. Before I go into details, I should like to mention that this question is to the Indian Mussulmans a vital question of religion.

Sometime it is being put forward that Indian Mussulmans desire to dictate to His Majesty's

Government and to the Allies. I assure you, Sir, that nothing could be further from our minds than to use an expression that could be construed into a desire to dictate or to threaten. But the question is whether the settlement with Turkey is an affair of imperial policy or merely a question affecting Great Britain. If this is a question affecting Great Britain alone, we have nothing further to say. But if, on the contrary, it is a question affecting the whole of the Empire, as it clearly is, then we have equally clearly a *locus standi*, and the policy of the Empire can no more be dictated by Great Britain alone than by Indian Mussulmans. It must be a common policy of the whole Empire. I think that it has been recognised by the entire community in India, both Mussulmans and Hindus, that things have come to such a pass that, as subjects of His Majesty, we should be failing in our duty if we did not say how matters stand with us.

It is not a question of Moslem sentiments, if by that we understand feelings that may be changed at will. There are certain clear religious obligations imposed on us by our faith. The question of the Khilafat is not only part of our faith, but, if I may put it in that way, it is the whole of our faith. The functions of the Khilafat unite both temporal and spiritual work which Islam believes it is charged with doing. At all times since the death of the Prophet there has been a Khilafat, and it must be preserved at all times by the entire body of the

Mussulmans. There has been no such thing as a merely spiritual headship of Islam. Islam, as we regard it is the last word in ethics, and the last word in guidance in all our affairs. Therefore every act of a Mussulman's life is, and must be, a religious act. Our duty to His Majesty is a religious duty. A man's duty to his family and his friends must be considered a religious duty. Therefore it would not be correct to try to distinguish between temporal leadership and spiritual leadership in this matter. The Khalifa is something more than a Pope. We feel there is likely to be some misunderstanding about this, and we consider it our duty to let it be known how we stand in regard to the Khilafat.

This institution, which is both temporal and religious, is, as I have said, to be preserved by the entire body of Islam. It is necessary for the Khalifa to have a certain amount of temporal power for the defence of our faith, and, although it may vary from time to time according to the strength of his possible enemies, there must always be a minimum which cannot be reduced with safety. We consider, speaking generally, that the Khalifa's power had been reduced after the Balkan War to about the minimum with which a Khalifa can maintain his dignity and act effectively as Defender of the Faith. That is why our irreducible minimum is the restoration of the *status quo ante bellum*. With less than that the Mussulmans do not think the Khalifa and the Commander of the Faithful could effectively

defend our faith if in any part of the world our religious freedom came to be in jeopardy.

We do not rule out by any means political, as apart from, territorial changes. We have no objection if the Peace Conference is to consider whether autonomy could be given to various non-Turkish communities living within the Turkish Empire, whether they be Christian, Moslem, or Jew. This would coincide entirely with the twelfth point of President Wilson's fourteen points, which required that security of life and opportunities of autonomous development should be assured to these communities. For these, guarantees may be taken from the Ottoman Government consistently with the dignity of a Sovereign State.

Then, quite apart from the main question of the preservation of the Khilafat with adequate temporal power, there is the question of the Jazirat-ul-Arab or "the Island of Arabia." To European geographers Arabia is only a peninsula, bounded on the fourth sides by land. But to Mussulmans it has always been an island, the fourth boundary being the waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates. It thus includes not only Hedjaz, Yemen, Nejd, and other provinces commonly included in Arabia, but also Syria, Palestine, and Mesopotamia. It is a religious obligation, based on the dying injunction of the Prophet, that within these limits there should be no non-Moslem control of any kind whatsoever. There was some likelihood of mandates being given to Christian

Powers like America, France, and Great Britain herself within that territory. We therefore considered it our duty to explain matters to the Indian Government, and then to the English Government, and to make it clear that no Mussulman could ever acquiesce in this. No Moslem could reconcile this to his conscience.

MR. FISHER: I understand you to say that the Moslem conscience could not acquiesce in a mandate over a territory such as Palestine or Syria being given to a Christian Power. How, on that showing, would it be right for the Moslem conscience to acquiesce in the British sovereignty over India?

MR. SYUD HOSSAIN: There is a great deal of difference. Arabia contains the Holy Places. It is in regard to this tract that control by non-Moslem communities is ruled out.

MR. MOHAMED ALI: Although I should be very sorry indeed to be understood to say anything at all that would tend to lessen the value of Constantinople, which has for nearly five centuries been the seat of the Khilafat, to Moslem sentiment, and to suggest that Mussulmans could willingly agree to lose any part of Dar-ul-Islam, I must say that even if Constantinople went out of Moslem hands, it would not have the same effect as if any portion of the sacred territory of the Jazirat-ul-Arab went out, or was placed under a non-Moslem mandatory. This tract, for the most part barren, has been marked out in a special manner in the various Scriptures

as being the land of the Prophets, and it is probably on that account that control over every part of it is required by Islam to be entirely Moslem. We who consider ourselves to be the spiritual heirs of Abraham and Moses and Jesus, consider that this is a land apart and consecrated in a peculiar degree and reserved for us. We are charged with the duty of maintaining its sanctity inviolate, of keeping it peaceful and tranquil, sanctuary for the Faithful, and safe for Theocracy. In order to preserve that sanctity and peace and tranquility which we desire, it is necessary that it should remain with us. It would be a sad day indeed for us when any part of it goes out of the hands of the Mussulmans, for then we would have betrayed a divine trust. Mussulmans will never acquiesce in any arrangement that permitted any form of control being exercised by a non-Moslem Power over any part of the Jazirat-ul-Arab.

Then there is a series of religious injunctions with regard to the Holy Places. The three sacred Harams of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem must always be in the custody and under the wardenship of the Khalifa, and the wardenship of no one else could satisfy the conscience of Mussulamans. Mussulmans also claim that the Shrines of Najaf, Karbala, Kazimain, Samarra, and Baghdad should remain under his wardenship. Non-Moslem control over the territory in which they are situated is not at all permissible.

If I may now reverse the order in which I have outlined the threefold claim of the Mussulmans, I will say that the three Sacred Harams of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem, and the Holy Shrines I have named in Mesopotamia, must continue to remain under the wardenship of the Khalifa precisely as they did before the war. They are all situated within the Jazirat-ul-Arab, and there must be exclusive Moslem control over every part of that region. Now, if that control is the Khalifa's control as before the war, not only will this religious requirement be fulfilled, but it will also assist in the fulfilment of the first religious requirement to which I have referred—namely, the preservation of the Khilafat with temporal power adequate for purposes of the defence of our faith. Therefore, if, on the one hand, the pledge of the Prime Minister of January 5, 1918, the solemnity of which he has now fully proclaimed, is redeemed in its entirety, and the twelfth point of President Wilson's fourteen points, on the basis of which armistice was concluded with Turkey, is honoured in the observance, and, on the other hand, the religious requirements imposed on the Mussulmans by their faith with regard to the Jazirat-ul-Arab and the Holy Places are respected, as we claim they should be respected as the basis of our loyalty, then the main requirement of the preservation of the Khilafat will be fulfilled and the territorial *status quo ante bellum* would be restored. This Delegation will be satis-

fied if the Khilafat is thus preserved with sufficient territory and temporal power, and, if necessary, guarantees may be taken for good government, security of life, religious toleration, and opportunities of autonomous development of the subject races, consistently with the dignity and independence of the Sovereign.

I would mention here that, while we recognise that it is the bounden duty of their subjects to maintain their allegiance to the Allied and Associated Governments, we desire to say that all Mussulmans are bound at the same time to maintain their allegiance to the Khilafat, and ask you to recognise that we have our religious as well as our political obligations. We do not desire, nor is it possible for us, to move away from the political position in which we stand, just as we do not desire that our position should be made embarrassing by any ill-considered action of these Governments with regard to the Khalifa's Government. If demands were made which we could not satisfy without prejudice to our salvation, we would have to consider the whole position in that case.

As regards the propaganda carried on in this country against the Turks, we feel that, when the Turks are accused of crimes against humanity, these accusations are due in a great measure to religious and racial prejudices ingrained for centuries past in the communities that indulge in these accusations, and in no inconsiderable measure also to the

greed and covetousness of Turkey's neighbours that have for long wanted to grab as much as they could of Ottoman territories. To say the very least of it these crimes have been much exaggerated. In some parts of the Christian world it is considered that the Turks should be driven out of Constantinople not only because they are Turks and guilty of criminal conduct, but because they are Moslem, and Islam itself is a blight. We have to remove these deeply-rooted prejudices and repudiate the association of criminal conduct with Islam. But at the same time we are also anxious to exert our influence as Mussulmans so that not only such things, but even the suspicion of such things, should not be possible in future. As regards the character of the Turk, we think it very different indeed from what it has so often been described to be. We should not like to say anything at all about the character of the propaganda of the Churches among other sources of mischief and prejudice. We are not here to increase any kind of bitterness. As a matter of fact, we have come on a mission of peace. But this much we will say, that before one can judge the Turks impartially, one has to enquire into the intrigues carried on for two centuries at least by the enemies of Turkey to foment trouble among her Christian subjects, and thereby make out a plausible case for lopping off parts of the Ottoman Empire in Europe and Asia. One will also have to enquire into the character of the dealings of these

Christian populations of Turkey with their Moslem neighbours, and ascertain whether these dealings were neighbourly or provocative. In any case, we think, that even if the Turks have been to a certain extent to blame it must be admitted that they have had a very great lesson, and I can assure you, Sir, that Indian Mussulmans do not think that they have nothing more to do if their claims are satisfied ; if a settlement is made such as they hope for, they would endeavour to create a desire in the Turks for reconciliation with the British Government and their Allies. They would also impress upon the Turks that not only must such atrocities as they are so recklessly accused of not occur, but they must also be above the suspicion of committing such atrocities. As Mussulmans we have to wipe off the stain of inhumanity from the fair name of Islam, and the British Government and their Allies can rest assured that Indian Mussulmans will not fail in their duty towards Islam in a matter of this kind. Their restraining influence would be utilised to the fullest extent. Our Mission is of a double character. It is our duty to represent matters to His Majesty's Government, because we are his subjects ; and it is our duty to represent matters to the Khalifa, who is the Commander of the Faithful. Both these duties we should like to observe. If a settlement such as we desire is made with the Khilafat, our influence for the good would naturally greatly increase, and it would be used in the interests of the Empire and

of humanity. But if the settlement goes against our sentiments and religious obligations, without saying one word which may be likely to be misconstrued into a threat, we must frankly state that we shall have to think of our religious duty first.

I should like to say that it is very difficult for His Majesty's Government, removed as it is, both in point of distance and religious and political surroundings, from India, to understand what is actually happening there. I do not like to say anything against the Government of India or the officials there if I can help it. They have been exceedingly courteous in receiving our Deputation and facilitating our departure from India and our coming over here. But I must say that the official world does not fully understand what is passing in the hearts of the people of the country. At any rate, I think, we are in a better position to understand how things stand with our people. A considerable portion of my life has been more or less a blank lately owing to internment and incarceration. I assure you, Sir it was only when we came out of the prison and saw things with our own eyes that we discovered—and it was a great shock to us—what the real state of the country was at the time of our release. India has changed so enormously that anyone who knew it five years ago would not recognise it to-day. It has changed so rapidly, in fact, that it is no longer a question of years but of months. Well, the officials in India at any rate do understand better

than most people here that if in the settlement with Turkey regard is not had for the religious obligations and the position of the Mussulmans, it will be a very serious matter indeed. I am not an Englishman, and cannot pretend to know the English language as well as Englishmen themselves know it, and I fear that words that I may use may sometimes bear a significance that I may not have intended. It is difficult for me to explain, but I will say this. I heard in the House of Commons soon after we came over to London and went to hear the debate on Constantinople, Colonel Wedgwood say: "You can get a great deal out of Englishmen by persuading them, but you must not use threats." Well, sir, I suppose that is true of every self-respecting people, and since it is true of Englishmen also, I will beg of you, sir, to tell me how to frame a warning, that would be the most serious of warnings, but would not be construed into a threat.

Finally, I may add that in some quarters hostile to Turkey, and even to India, efforts are being made to belittle the importance of the mission which has brought us here, and it is said that the Indian Khilafat Delegation is inimpressive. With reference to this, all that I can say is that we could have brought a larger body of men with us, and also people more distinguished than ourselves. But it must be understood that work has to be done in India also, and we cannot spare many men for the

work here ; and it ought to be understood that we do represent the entire body of Mussulmans of India, and the vast bulk of our Hindu compatriots and other who are in this matter at one with us.

Mr. SYUD HOSSAIN: I should like to supplement what has been said by one or two observations. The question has been raised, both in the Press here and in India, that in this matter Mahomedan agitators are trying to make political capital, and that there is no foundation of any religious feeling in it. I should like to say that this is utterly untrue. In this matter, at any rate, it is our duty to inform His Majesty's Government that it is not really a political question so far as we are concerned. It is purely a religious question. I should like to say this in support that Turkey has been at war with the various European nations for the last 300 years. Sometimes she has fought with the active support of England. Sometimes she has won, sometimes lost. We Mahomedans in India never raised the question of the Khilafat at all. This is the first time in the history of British rule in India that the question has arisen, and it has been raised now because the Khilafat has been put in jeopardy. That is the important feature. It is in jeopardy for this reason. As the result of the last war the territories of the Ottoman Empire, including those regions regarded as sacred, are being brought into the melting pot. The impression in India is that some of these territories are about to be annexed by Great Britain

herself, and I can assure you that this possibility has created a very great deal of anxiety and alarm and very genuine feelings which are not pleasant, because, as the Mahomedans view it, up to now strict religious neutrality has been the foundation of British rule in India ; and certainly the loyalty of the Indian Mahomedans, which has been a tradition of English rule, has been largely built up by the fact that so far as their religious life was concerned, they enjoyed a very uncommon degree of freedom and security. But now the situation is that apparently Great Britain herself is going to be a party to the dismemberment not only of the Turkish Empire, but to the dismemberment of the actual realm of the Khilafat. This area, according to Islamic law, has got to be under the guardianship of the Khalifa and no body else. If by any direction of the British Empire this region is given to any non-Islamic power, the Indian Mahomedan has got to choose between his loyalty to the British Crown and his spiritual allegiance to the Khalifa. It is a choice which he would prefer to avoid. I mention this point to make it clear that this is not a political question. It is a religious question.

Then I would say this. The question has also been raised in more than one quarter that the Hindus in India have got nothing on earth to do with the Khilafat question, and that the fact that they are making common cause with the Mahomedans in itself argues that this is a political move-

ment rather than a religious question. As to that, I would say that if you were aware of recent facts in Indian national life you would at once see that this is not the case. During the last few months, certainly during the last year, there has been a very extraordinary fusion of Hindu and Mahomedan feeling in India, and the reason why the Hindus have come into this movement is because from the Indian point of view they have come to regard the Khilafat issue as a national rather than a sectarian question. They have taken this view chiefly on account of Mr. Gandhi.

Mr. Gandhi has laid down the principle that inasmuch as the chief thing we are out to have is Indian national unity ; if it is the case that so many crores of Indian Mahomedans feel that this is a matter of life and death to them, then the Hindu, consistently with the idea of national unity, cannot stand aside. Mr. Gandhi has said they must make common cause with their Mahomedan compatriots exactly as he would expect us to make common cause with the Hindus if the Hindus were up against similar difficulties. That is why there has been nothing of a hole-and-corned nature in this matter. They have all come in with a clear recognition of this point that in so far as they desire to have a common Indian nation, and we form a great part of that nation, what affects us so closely must be a matter which concerns the Hindus also. This is

an All-India question. They are just as committed to our cause as we are ourselves.

The All-India Khilafat Conference formally adopted a Manifesto which is really the mandate of the Delegation which we comprise, and in this document, which I would ask your permission to quote, is set forth very briefly the whole of our position.

Mr. MOHAMED ALI: I might mention that before drawing this up, in which Mr. Gandhi took a considerable share, he desired to have before him Mahomedan experts. He had them and he cross-examined them at great length and in great detail, and entirely satisfied himself that these were our religious obligations.

Mr. SYUD HOSSAIN: The Manifesto says that the claim on behalf of the Mahomedans of India in connection with the Turkish peace terms may be divided into two sections:—

1. Regarding the Khilafat.
2. Regarding what is called "Jazirat-ul-Arab", and the Holy Places of Islam.

The claim regarding the Khilafat consists in leaving the Turkish Empire as it was at the time of the war, with such guarantees being taken by the League of Nations as may be necessary for the due protection of the rights of non-Moslem or non-Turkish races living with the Turkish Empire, consistently with its dignity as a Sovereign State.

The second claim consists in the sovereignty

over the "Jazirat-ul-Arab" *i.e.*, Arabia as defined by Moslem religious authorities, and the custody of the Holy Places of Islam.

Arabia as thus defined is bounded by the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean, the Persian Gulf, the Euphrates, and the Tigris. The Holy Places include the three Sacred Harams—namely, Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem; and the Holy Shrines—namely, Najaf, Karbala, Samara, Kazimain, and Baghdad.

In reality this claim is included in the first, but it is distinguishable from it in that the custody of the Holy Places has ever since the establishment of Islam been under the Khilafat, and unlike the boundary of the latter, which has fluctuated from time to time, has never suffered any diminution whatsoever. This claim does not exclude genuine Arab Self-Government, but it does exclude the present arrangement, because those who know understand the unreality behind it. The claim now said to be made by Sharif Hussain and by Amir Feisul is inconsistent, in fact, with their acceptance of even the Spiritual Sovereignty of the Khilafat.

The claim is primarily based upon the religious requirements and the sentiments of the Mahomedans of India in common with those of Mahomedans all the world over, and is supported by, so far as the Khilafat, the Harams, and the "Jazirat-ul-Arab" are concerned, testimony from the Quran or from the traditions of the Prophet, and, for the rest, by other

religious authority. It is further supported regarding the Holy Places by the deliberate declaration of the Government of India, on behalf of His Majesty's Government of India, as also the Governments of France and Russia, of November 2, 1914.

I need not read the citations. They include Mr. Lloyd George's pledge of January 5, 1918, and President Wilson's twelfth point.

The Manifesto concludes thus :—

It is necessary to state the likely consequences of a wrong decision on the part of the Imperial Government or the Allied and Associated Powers. The claim is supported by practically the whole of the Hindu population in India. It has assumed, therefore, an Indian national status. The policy of the British Government has been definitely stated to be that of making India an equal partner. Recent events have awakened India to a sense of her dignity. In these circumstances, the British Empire, as one consisting of free nationalities, can only hold together the three chief communities—the Hindus, the Mahomedans, and the Christians. It is therefore urged that the British Ministers are bound not merely to press the Mahomedan, or rather the Indian claim before the Supreme Council, but to make it their own. If, however, for any reason whatever they fail to do so, and the Supreme Council also fails to perform its elementary duty of giving effect to the declarations that brought about an

Armistice, it is futile to expect peace in India, and the Khilafat Conference will fail in its duty if it hesitated to warn His Majesty's Ministers that an affront put upon the seven crores of Mahomedans in India, supported by the twenty three crores of Hindus and others, will be incompatible with an expectation of blind loyalty. Beyond that it is impossible for the Conference to foresee the results. It may be added that even if the members of the Conference attempted seriously to pacify the Mahomedan mind, it is futile to expect that they would succeed in healing the wound that would be made in the heart of Mahomedan India by the denial of justice and breach of pledges in a matter of vital importance to that community.

SIR WILLIAM DUKE: I do not quite follow the bearing on the Sacred Places of Jazirat-ul-Arab; I understand that the principal Holy Places in Mesopotamia are only places of pilgrimage for the Shiahs who do not recognise the Khalifa.

MR. MOHAMED ALI: The Holy Places are held in very great reverence and by all sects; many Sunni Mahomedans also visit the shrines.

SIR WILLIAM DUKE: The bulk of the pilgrims are Shiahs. It is not in the same way a necessary pilgrimage to the Sunnis.

MR. FISHER: You have come a very long journey to put your case before the British Government, and although you apologised for your English, I may say that there is very little need for

an apology. You put your case very fully and very clearly and, if I may say so, very temperately before us. The British Government is, of course, well aware that it had the valuable assistance of a million Indian soldiers in the recent war, and that many of those soldiers were Moslems by religion, and it is aware of its obligations not only to the Moslem soldiers who fought for it in the war, but to all its loyal Moslem subjects in India ; and I think you may feel assured that we are anxious to study the religious susceptibilities and sympathies of your fellow-believers, and that whatever conclusions may be reached in respect of the international settlement, the settlement of the world's affairs, attention to the Indian aspect of the case will always be given. Indeed, it is no secret that the decision which has recently been taken by the Allied and Associated Powers to retain Turkish sovereignty in Constantinople has been to a large extent influenced by the desire of the British Government to meet the religious feelings of its Moslem subjects in India. Still, of course, you will realise that, while that is an important factor, and a factor which the British Government will never lose sight of, it is not the sole factor which the Ministers responsible to the British Government have to take into account in these far-reaching and complex transactions. There are other factors as well. Of course, as you, I think, are perfectly well aware, consideration for the position of the subject peoples of the Turkish Empire

is one of the elements which has to be taken into account, and I feel that I ought to remind you of the fact that a very painful impression has been created in this country by the news of the recent massacres in Cilicia. I wish to point out to you that the issue is a complex one ; but one to the solution of which the British Government brings very steadfast good-will to the Moslem population of India, and you may be assured that what you have said will be duly considered by the Government.

Mr. Mohamed Ali, you have been very careful to avoid anything in the nature of the language of threats, and you have been wise in doing so. Of course, as you realise perfectly well from your large experience of public affairs, the British Government is bound to frame its views on wide considerations of policy, and cannot be deflected one inch from its course by anything in the nature of threats. But at the same time the British Government is bound to give due consideration to any views which may be sincerely felt and honestly expressed by loyal subjects of the Empire.

I very much regret that the Secretary of State has not been able to receive this deputation. He desired to do so. He is disappointed that he is unable to meet you ; but, as you are aware, he is unwell at the present moment, and consequently I am taking his place. I hope, however, that before you return to India you may have an opportunity of meeting the Prime Minister and of laying your views

before him. As you know, a Conference is taking place at the present time. The Prime Minister is meeting the statesmen of the Allied countries in Downing Street, and many important issues are being discussed. Mr. Lloyd George's time is very much occupied, and I cannot promise you that he will be able to see you, but I hope that he may be able to do so.

Gentlemen, I have only one other thing to say, and it is this. As a philosopher once said, history is always a *pis aller* a choice of second best. It is founded on compromise. We cannot all get everything that we want, but you may be quite certain that the British Government will never fail in giving due consideration to feelings loyally and sincerely expressed by subjects of the Empire.

MR. MOHAMED ALI: May I express the thanks of the Delegation for the reception that you have so cordially given to us? I quite understand, I think all of us understand, even the most illiterate in India, that our desires and sentiments cannot be the sole factor in a settlement of this kind. But there is one point that has not been entirely appreciated that we particularly desire to lay stress upon, namely, that there are certain religious obligations that are of such a binding character that they must be our first consideration; and since our loyalty is based on respect for our religious obligations, regard for them must be the first consideration of His Majesty's Government also. It is true that life is

one long second best, and that compromise is of the very essence of politics. It is precisely because we recognise this that we have not asked for anything more than the restoration of the *status quo ante bellum*. But if a new earth and a new heaven were to be created, as we were at one time led to hope from the utterances of the statesmen of Allied and Associated Nations, and if, therefore, all the territories taken and retained by force were to be restored to their rightful owners, then we would have asked for the return of Egypt, of Tripoly, of Bosnia and Herzegovina, of Crete, and of the large slices of Turkish territory carved out by the Balkan Allies. But we have not done that, though we are in full sympathy with the just demands of our co-religionists there. It is therefore quite clear that we have already applied the maxim of *pis aller* in the region in which it can be applied. But in the domain of faith and religious obligations there can be no compromises. That is a matter to which the *pis aller* does not apply. There we can only have the best, and the best is just good enough. There the second best is just as bad as the very worst.

With regard to our desire for interviews with the Prime Minister, we recognise his position, and understand how difficult it must be for him to find time. But, if I may say so, without disrespect, if Mr. Venizelos can come often and have the ear of His Majesty's Government, it will only seem right that representatives of Indian Mussulmans and

Indians generally, who, as you have acknowledged, Sir, have come here from long distance, should be given a fair hearing and enabled to put their case before His Majesty's Ministers before decisions are taken.

As regards the "Cilician massacres," we believe that the news that has come over here is from very tainted sources. So far as we are concerned, we should like a thorough and impartial enquiry into the whole question of these so-called massacres, and we would court the utmost publicity for the investigation into the offences alleged against the Turks and its results. Let there be a Commission sent out to examine the facts and the causes that have brought about a state of affairs that all alike must deplore. So far Greeks and Jews and Armenians all have been sending all sorts of roving Commissions, and it is the Indian Mussulmans alone that have been kept out. They could therefore well ask for a Commission of their own being permitted to enquire into these massacres. But, to permit no possibility of a suspicion of partiality, we say that English people as well as Indians should be represented on this Commission. Not the highest among us would consider such a task beneath him and even His Exalted Highness the Nizam and other Indian rulers, Ulma like Maulana Abdul Bari and Maulana Mahmud-ul-Hasan, and leaders of Indian public opinion, both Hindu and Moslem, would gladly welcome such an opportunity to sift the truth.

Let there be a thorough investigation. If the Turk be as he is said to be, we will wash our hands of him. We do not wish Islam to be regarded as the supporter of murderers.

There is one thing more that I must ask your permission to refer to. There have been certain statements in the speeches, both of the Prime Minister and of the Leader of the House of Commons, with reference to the Khalifa, the seat of the Khilafat and the Allies' garrisoning of the Straits. We think we can understand that the exigencies of Parliamentary debates, and politics generally, sometimes drive politicians to attempt to reconcile opposite points of view and satisfy all parties, and to express opinions in a language which they would have preferred not to use, and would not have used in the intimacy of private discussions. But if it is really to be the case that the Khalifa is to be kept at Constantinople under the guns of the Allied Powers, and is to exist in constant fear even of his own life, his position would be worse than that of the Pope at the Vatican. He would be the Pope at Avignon, and even worse than that, for he would be a prisoner of people of alien faith and race. If that is to be the case, we would far rather see him in exile at Broussa, or even Koniah, than in such a plight. The consequences of such an affront to Islam cannot be exaggerated and cannot wisely be underrated.

MAULANA SYUD SULAIMAN NADVI: I should just like to add that I am perhaps the first Indian

"Maulvi" that has come over to this country. I am not a politician, nor is Maulana Abdul Bari Sahib, of the famous family of Ulama of Feringi Mahal, Lucknow, who has particularly asked me to represent him. This ought to convince His Majesty's Government that this is not a political matter to us, but a religious matter.

THE INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION.

OFFICIAL INTERVIEW WITH THE PRIME MINISTER.

Present.

Right Hon. David Lloyd George,
Right Hon. H. A. L. Fisher,
Sir Frederick William Duke, G.C.I.E., K.C.S.I.
Mr. Mohamed Ali,
Mr. Syud Hossain,
Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nadvi,
Mr. H. M. Hayat,

The Prime Minister: Now, Mr. Mohamed Ali, will you state your case?

MR. MAHOMED ALI: I have just noted down a few points which, if you will permit me, I will amplify as I proceed, so that you will have a fair record of what we desire to present. First of all, with regard to our credentials, I suppose it is not necessary for me to go into that matter?

THE PRIME MINISTER: No, I know exactly who you are and whom you represent.

MR. MOHAMED ALI: I only want to make it clear that we have come here chiefly in connection with a religious question, which is of the greatest importance to us. With regard to this, we desire to point out what is the connection of Indian Mussulmans with the Khilafat. Islam, as we understand it is not a set of doctrines and dogmas ; it is a complete outlook on life, a moral code and a social polity. It recognises no lacerating and devitalising distinctions between things spiritual and things temporal, between Church and State. It looks upon life as one unity, as one indivisible synthesis, and it purports to provide Divine guidance for all the affairs of mankind. Muslims regard themselves as servants of God, owing allegiance to Him in the first place, and acknowledging his authority alone in the last resort. Islam recognises no ethnical, geographical or political barriers to free human intercourse and sympathy. Islam's whole outlook on life is supernational rather than national. Islam has always had two centres, the first a personal one and the other a local one. The personal centre is the Caliph, or the Khalifa, as we call him, the successor of the Prophet. Because the Prophet was the personal centre of Islam, his successors, or Khalifas, continue his tradition to this day. The local centre is the region known as the Jazirat-ul-Arab, or the "Island of Arabia," the "Land of the Prophets." To Islam, Arabia has been not a peninsula but an island, the fourth boundary being the

waters of the Euphrates and the Tigris. The Khalifa is the Commander of the Faithful in all matters for which Islam provides Divine guidance, and his orders are to be obeyed by all Mussulmans as long as they do not conflict with the Commandments of God and the Traditions of the Prophet.

For the defence of the Faith, the Commander of the Faithful must always retain adequate territories, naval and military forces, and financial resources, all of which can be summed up in the expression "temporal power."

"There is no compulsion in faith," says the Quran. Force is to be used in Islam only when its opponents depend on the argument of force alone. All that a Muslim is and a Muslim has are part of a Divine Trust. A Muslim cannot, without betraying that trust, hold anything back if it is required for the defence of the Faith and for serving the purposes, for God. That is the rationale of the necessity of temporal power for the successors of the Prophet. Since the world still relies on force, the Khalifa cannot dispense with temporal power.

To come to our claims, Sir, the first claim that we put forward is that the Khilafat must be preserved by the entire body of Muslims at all times with adequate temporal power. The standard of temporal power necessary for the preservation of the Khilafat must obviously, therefore, be a relative one. Not going into the matter more fully we would say that after the various wars in which

Turkey has been engaged recently, and after the Balkan War particularly, the Empire of the Khalifa was reduced to such low limits that Muslims considered the irreducible minimum of temporal power adequate for the defence of the Faith to be the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*.

Nevertheless, Muslims have not by any means ruled out such political changes within the scheme of Turkey's sovereignty as would guarantee security of life and property and opportunities of autonomous development of all communities, whether Muslim, Christian or Jewish, consistently with the dignity and independence of the Sovereign State.

THE PRIME MINISTER: Does that mean, for instance, that you are opposed to the act of the Syrian Mohamedans who declared Emir Feisal King of Arabia.

MR. MOHAMED ALI: Yes, I was suggesting that presently, but since you have asked me that question, I should like to say that we think this matter can well be left for settlement amongst Muslims. Just as we have certain religious obligations with regard to the Khilafat that have brought us here, we have other religious obligations, equally solemn and binding, that require us to approach the Turks and Arabs. "All Muslims are brothers, wherefore make peace between your brethern," is a Quranic injunction. We have come here in the interests of peace and reconciliation, and propose going to the Arabs and Turks for the same purpose.

THE PRIME MINISTER: I am rather on the question of temporal power for the Khalifa, because your proposition was that the power which was enjoyed by the Sultan at the beginning of this war represented the irreducible minimum of temporal power. Now, I understand, though I have had only very imperfect reports, that the Mohamedans of Syria and Palestine and some other parts have proclaimed an independent Moslem State torn away from the Khalifa.

MR. MOHAMED ALI: I hope, Sir, it will be possible for us, if we are given an opportunity to meet these people, to reconcile them. There have been differences between the Arabs and the Turks. but I hope the Emir Feisal, when he looks upon the matter from the point of view of a Muslim, as he is bound to do, will realise that his own personal ambitions, and even the ambitions of the Arabs. can be entirely satisfied within the scheme of Turkish sovereignty.

THE PRIME MINISTER: That means that you are opposed to the independence of Arabia?

MR. MOHAMED ALI: Yes, I was suggesting that Mussulmans did not by any means, when asking for the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum* rule out changes which would guarantee to the Christians, Jews and Mussulmans, within the scheme of the Ottoman sovereignty, security of life and property and opportunities of autonomous development, so long as it is consistent with the

dignity and independence of the Sovereign State. It will not be a difficult matter. We have here an Empire in which the various communities live together. Some already are sufficiently independent and others hope—and here I refer to India—to get a larger degree of autonomy than they possess at the present moment ; and consistently with our desire to have autonomous development ourselves, we could not think of denying it to Arabs or Jews or Christians within the Turkish Empire. I think our own Empire provides for us means whereby this thing could be assured.

Quite apart from the main claim for the preservation of the Khilafat with adequate temporal power, the Muslims claim that the local centre of their faith—namely, the “Island of Arabia”—should remain inviolate and entirely in Muslim control. This is based on the dying injunction of the Prophet himself. The Jazirat-ul-Arab, as its name indicates, is the “Island of Arabia,” the fourth boundary being the waters of the Tigris and the Euphrates. It therefore includes Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, as well as the region commonly known to European geographers as the Arabian peninsula. Muslims can acquiesce in no form of non-Muslim control, whether in the shape of mandates or otherwise, over any portion of this region. A religious requirement, which is absolutely binding on us, requires that at least there shall be exclusively Muslim control. It does not specify that it should be the Khalifa’s own

control. In order to make it perfectly clear, I may say, the religious requirement, Sir, will be satisfied even if the Emir Feisal exercises independent control there. But since we have got to provide sufficient territories and resources and naval and military forces for the Khalifa, the requirement of the utmost economy which has to rule and govern all our claims in these matters suggests that both these requirements may easily be satisfied if the Jazirat-ul-Arab remains, as before the war, under the direct sovereignty of the Khalifa. We have great hopes that if we have opportunities of meeting our co-religionists we shall bring about a reconciliation between them and the Turks. After all, it cannot be said that Turkish rule in Arabia has been of such a character that other Powers are bound to interfere. We have not heard of any atrocities, at any rate, here, and you must have seen, Sir, that in that one region where there was at one time a great struggle going on, Yemen, they did not part company with the Turks in this war.

The third claim that the Mussalmans have charged us with putting before you is based on a series of injunctions which require the Khalifa to be the warden of the three sacred Harams of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem ; and overwhelming Muslim sentiment requires that he should be the warden of the holy shrines of Najaf, Karbala, Kazimain, Samara and Baghdad, all of which are situated within the confines of the "Island of Arabia."

Although Muslims rely on their religious obligations for the satisfaction of the claims which I have specified above, they naturally find additional support in your own pledge, Sir, with regard to Constantinople, Thrace, and Asia Minor, the populations of which are overwhelmingly Muslim. They trust that a pledge so solemnly given and recently renewed will be redeemed in its entirety. Although the same degree of sanctity cannot be claimed for Constantinople as for the three sacred Harams—Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem. Constantinople is nevertheless held very sacred by all the Muslims of the world, and the uninterrupted historic tradition of nearly five centuries has created such an overwhelming sentiment with regard to Islambol, or the "City of Islam" a title which no city has up to this time enjoyed that an effort to drive the Turks out "bag and baggage" from the seat of the Khilafat is bound to be regarded by the Moslems of the world as a challenge of the modern Crusaders to Islam and of European domination to the entire East, which cannot be taken up by the Muslim world or the East without great peril to our own Empire, and, in fact, to the allied dominions in Asia and Africa. In this connection, Sir, I might mention one point, that the Muslims cannot tolerate any affront to Islam in keeping the Khalifa as a sort of hostage in Constantinople. He is not the Pope at the Vatican, much less can he be the Pope at Avignon, and I am bound to say that the recent action of the Allied

Powers is likely to give rise in the Muslim world to feelings which it will be very difficult to restrain, and which would be very dangerous to the peace of the world.

As regards Thrace, it is not necessary to support the Turkish claim for their retention of Thrace by any further arguments than that of the principle of self-determination. Its fair and honest application will ensure the satisfaction of that claim.

As regards Smyrna, the occupation of Smyrna by the Greeks, who were not even at war with Turkey, under the auspices of the Allies, has shaken to a great extent the confidence which Muslims reposed in the pledges given to them, and the atrocities perpetrated in that region have driven them almost to desperation. Muslims can discover no justification for this action except the desire of Greek capitalists to exploit the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor, which are admittedly the homelands of the Turks. If this state of affairs is allowed to continue, not only will the Turk be driven out, "bag and baggage" from Europe, but he will have no "bag and baggage" left to him, even in Asia. He would be paralysed, commercially and industrially, in a land-locked small Emirate in Asia Minor, the speedy bankruptcy of which is certain. The application of the principle of self-determination would entirely rule out the Greek claim in this fertile region, which obviously tempts the greed of the capitalist and the exploiter.

As regards Cilicia, reasons similar to those that have prompted the action of Greeks in Smyrna seem clearly, Cilicia, and obviously it is the Gulf of Alexandretta which is attracting some people as the Gulf of Smyrna is attracting others.

I do not overlook the fact of the massacres. No Muslim would dream of giving his support to those truly guilty of massacres and other equally revolting crimes. The Indian Khilafat Delegation must put on record their utter detestation of such conduct and their full sympathy for the sufferers, whether they be Christian or Muslim. But, if the Turk is to be punished as a criminal, and populations of other races and creeds are to be released from their allegiance to the Ottoman Sovereign on the assumption that the Turks have been tyrants in the past and their rule is intolerable, then the Delegation claim that the whole question of these massacres must be impartially investigated by an International Commission on which the All-India Khilafat Conference should be adequately represented. This we have already submitted to you, Sir, in the course of a telegram which we had the honour to send. Where casualties have in fact taken place, not only should their true extent be ascertained, but the Commission should go fully into the so-called massacres and the intrigues of Tsarist Russia in Asia Minor after the success of similar intrigues in the Balkans ; it should go into the question of the organisation of revolutionary societies by the Christian subjects of the

Sultan, the rebellious character of which was subversive of his rule ; it should go into the provocation offered to the Moslem majority in this region, and the nature of the struggle between the contending parties and the character of the forces engaged on either side.

THE PRIME MINISTER : I am not quite sure about your argument here. Do you deny the existence of these massacres, or are you justifying them?

MR. MOHAMED ALI : I neither deny their existence nor justify them in the least ; I say that so far as we are concerned we are not in a position to affirm or to deny anything. We simply claim as Muslims—we are not Turks, but Muslims—that if on this assumption the Turk is to be punished in any way, then there should be a thorough and impartial enquiry.

THE PRIME MINISTER : In the reply which the Turkish Delegation gave to us in Paris they admitted these massacres. Their only reply was that a much larger number of Muslims had been massacred by misgovernment in Asia Minor.

MR. MOHAMED ALI : If you will permit me to say so, I will say that I think the Turks themselves are in a much better position than we are to say who actually represent them and who do not represent them ; but I do not think that any large section of the Turkish population considers that the delegates who came over to Paris some time ago did truly represent them. I am not associated although

it is suggested I am associated—in any way with the Committee of Union and Progress ; I have had no intercourse with them ; I do not even know the names of prominent members of the Committee. Once only did I send a message, under the auspices of the Government of India, to Talaat Bey, as he then was the Minister of the Interior, asking him not to enter the war—to think a thousand times before he entered the war, and explaining that our position in India would be extremely sad if they entered the war against England. That is my only connection with it.

THE PRIME MINISTER: That was very sound advice ; I wish they had taken it. We never sought the war with Turkey.

MR. MOHAMED ALI: I quite understand that.

THE PRIME MINISTER: We 'certainly never dreamed of it ; and the declaration of war was by Turkey against us

MR. MOHAMED ALI: I think we should have been utilised at that time as a powerful leverage by the British Government—we loyal Mussulmans. We could have been utilised with some success in bringing home to the Turks what they were going in for at the time. However, that is a thing of the past.

THE PRIME MINISTER: Let me have a copy of the Turkish Memorandum.

MR. MOHAMED ALI: It was published in the "Times," and I have read it in India. With regard to that I would say that what one party says about

the other party cannot always be relied upon. If the Turks are to be punished, it will not be His Excellency Demad Ferid Pasha, or people of his way of thinking. The people probably who were in power at the time would be considered war criminals to-day, I have no brief for them ; I have no brief for the Turks ; I have only a brief for Islam and the Indian Muslims. What we say is this, as I said to Mr. Fisher—let there be a thorough enquiry, and if this thorough enquiry is carried out, and if it establishes to the satisfaction of the world that the Turks really have been guilty of unprovoked murders, and have been guilty of these atrocities and horrible crimes, then we will wash our hands of the Turks. To us it is much more important that not a single stain should remain on the fair name of Islam. We want to convert the whole world to our way of thinking, but with what face could we go before the whole world and say we are the brethren of murderers and massacrers? But we know the whole history of these massacres to some extent. It is only in Armenia that the Turk is said to be so intolerant ; there are other parts of the world where he deals with Christian people, and where he deals with the Jewish community. No complaints of massacres come from those communities. Then the Armenians themselves lived under Turkish rule for centuries and never complained. The farthest back that we can go to discover any trace of this is the beginning of the last century. But in reality the “massacres”

begin only in the last quarter of the last century. It is pretty clear that they begin after the success of efforts like those made in the Balkans by Russia, which has never disguised its desire to take Constantinople since the time of Peter the Great. It has always wanted to go to Tsargrad, as is called, that is, the city of the Tsars. They wanted to go there. They tried these things in the Balkans, and they succeeded beyond their expectation, only probably Bulgaria became too independent when it became Greater Bulgaria. But in the case of the Armenians, they had people who were not very warlike, who had no sovereign ambitions themselves, and who were also to a great extent afraid of conversation to another branch of the Orthodox Church, the Russian branch, so that they were not very willing tools. Still, they were egged on, and plots and intrigues went on all the time. These people were incited, and they understood that if they made a compromise with Tsarist Russia they would get something better. It was then that these massacres came on the scene. No doubt there have been several outcries about them ; some evidence has been produced ; but there has been no thorough international enquiry which would satisfy the entire world, Muslim as well as Christian. It is in that connection that we earnestly appeal to you, to the whole of Christendom, to the whole of Europe and America, that if the Turk is to be punished on the assumption that he is a tyrant, that his rule is a blasting tyranny, and that he ought

to be punished, in that case the evidence should be of such a character that it should be absolutely above suspicion. We humbly submit that that evidence does not exist to-day. Even in to-day's "Times" we read about these "innocent lambs"—I do not use the word in any spirit of bitterness towards the Armenian Christians—we are not here to add to the prevailing bitterness, but to lessen it if we can—we read in to-day's "Times" of the horrors perpetrated by these very people. We see the propaganda that is being carried on from day to day in this country, and from that one would judge that these Armenians are innocent people, probably a large majority of the people who are ruled by Pashas and Effendis who were in a minority, and were capitalists who were grinding the people and massacring them all the time. Englishmen and other European Christians who have been in Turkish territory consider that the Turk is a very humane person. I do not know what possibly could have happened to the Turk that all of a sudden he loses all his humanity in Armenia and becomes the cruel tyrant that all of us, Christians and Muslims alike, must abhor. Therefore, if any decision is to be used on that assumption, the evidence must be such that it is entirely above suspicion. We have not to deal only with a few people who may be convinced that the Turk is not being punished because he is Muslim. We have to deal with millions of people, from whose minds the wrong impression should be removed. I am absolutely

certain that you and your Government are as anxious as any of us that there should not be the least suspicion that you are going to deal with the Turkish question in the spirit of the Crusaders, or of European domination. We, too, want to create that impression in the East. If we had no desire for reconciliation we would not have come here. We have come for reconciliation, to ask for a real and true peace in the world. I can quite understand that great delay has taken place in concluding peace with Turkey. The Government has pointed out that the British are not responsible for that. Nor are we, nor, probably, are the Turks. Six months or a year is not too long a time for a proper investigation if a truly final settlement is to be made, and not a settlement which would sow the seed of future wars.

I do not like to tax your patience, Sir, by going on much longer. Our request simply is this, for a thorough and impartial enquiry on which the All-India Khilafat Conference should be adequately represented. I said to Mr. Fisher when we were before him that, if the Turk is really such a person, and the Khilafat has such a Government, apart from any consideration for the Christian point of view, we have to consider from our own point of view, as Muslims, whether such a Khilafat could be tolerated any longer. We have the tradition of the Prophet's own grandson, Hosain who had only 72 followers when he opposed the large forces of Yazid, and died on the field of Karbela because no true Muslim

could owe any allegiance to such tyrant. If the Turk is a bigger tyrant? If that is proved to the satisfaction of Mussulmans, the whole question of the Khilafat will have to go into the melting-pot. That will be a most serious thing, but we are bound to do it in the interests of Islam itself.

I think I might now turn to the Jewish claims in Palestine. The Delegation have no desire to cause an injustice to the Jewish community, and I think Islam can look back with justifiable pride on its treatment of this community in the past. No aspiration of the Jewish community which is reasonable can be incompatible with Moslem control of the Holy Land, and it is hoped that the Ottoman Government will easily accommodate the Jewish community in such aspirations of theirs as are reasonable. Some responsible propagandists of the Zionist movement with whom I have had conversations frankly admit: "We do not want political sovereignty there; we want a home; the details can be arranged and discussed." I asked them: "Do you mean that Great Britain herself should be the sovereign power there, or should be the mandatory?" and they said: "No, what we want is an ordinary humanly speaking reasonable guarantee that opportunities of autonomous development would be allowed to us. We, ourselves, who have been living in India, are great believers in a sort of Federation of Faiths. I think the Indian nationality which is being built up to-day will probably be one

of the first examples in the world of a Federation of Faiths and we cannot rule out the possibility of development in Palestine on the lines of "cultural autonomy." The Jews are, after all, a very small minority there, and I do not believe for one moment that Jews could be attracted there in such large numbers as the Zionist enthusiasts sometimes think. I would say the same thing of an Armenian State, without desiring to say one word which would be considered offensive to any class of people. Because we, ourselves, have suffered so many humiliations, we do not like ourselves to say anything about other people that they would resent. If the Allied Powers brought all the Armenians together and placed them all in a contiguous position, excluding the present Kurdish community from them, no matter what large slice of land you gave them, I think they would very much like to go back to the old status.

The PRIME MINISTER: Are you talking now of the Armenians?

Mr. MOHAMED ALI: Yes. In the same way I would say of the Jewish community that they are people who prosper very much in other lands, and although they have a great hankering after their home, and no community is so much bound up with a particular territory as the Jewish community is, still I must say that we do not fear there will be any great migration of such a character that it will make a majority over the Muslim population. The Jewish community has said: "We have no objec-

tion to Turkish sovereignty remaining in that part of the world so long as we are allowed to remain and prosper there and develop on our own lines, and have cultural autonomy."

With regard to the Arabs, about whom you asked me a little while ago, the Delegation are not apprehensive with regard to the feasibility of an adjustment between the Khalifa and the Arabs. As I have already pointed out, there is the Quranic injunction: "All Muslims are brothers, wherefore make peace between your brethren." That is a duty laid upon us, and recently, at the Bombay Session, the All-India Khilafat Conference passed a resolution authorising a Delegation to proceed to the Hedjaz and other parts of Arabia to reconcile the Arabs and the Turks. Our interest is in the Khilafat as Mussulmans. No population and no territory could be so dear to the Muslim as the Arabs and Arabia. The Turks could not win such affection from us as the Arabs do. This is the land what we want to keep purely, under a mandate in that country we will not consent. We are bound by our religious obligations to that extent. Therefore, it cannot be through antipathy against the Arabs or because of any particular sympathy for the Turks that we desire the Khalifa's sovereignty over the Island of Arabia. The Turks are much farther removed from us. Very few of us know anything of the Turkish Empire. But we do go in large numbers to Mecca and Medina. So many of us

want to die there. So many Mussulmans settle down and marry in Arabia ; one of my own aunts is an Arab lady. Wherever we have met Arabs on our journey—we have had no opportunity, of course, of discussing the subject with well-educated people, but we have asked the class of people we have met what they thought of the action of the King of the Hedjaz—"King" in a land where God alone is recognised as a King ; nobody can ever claim Kingship there. They said his was an act that they condemned ; it was an act they did not in the least like. They considered it to be wrong ; the Arabs spoke disparagingly of it. I do not know to what extent it may be true, but there is a number of people who now come forward as apologists for the Arabs. They say that what Emir Faisal and the Sharif did was to save something for Islam ; it was not that they were against the Turks, but they were for Islam. Whether this was or was not the fact, it is very significant that such apologies should be made now. Honestly, we have no apprehensions that we could not reconcile the Arabs and the Turks. This is a question which I think the Allied Council, the Peace Conference, could very well leave the Mussulmans to settle amongst themselves. We do not want British bayonets to force the Arabs into a position of subservience to the Turks. That can be very easily arranged, and if such a Federation as we dream of becomes a reality—and I do not see why it should not—the Arabs would have all the

independence they require. They may claim national independence, but they cannot forget that Islam is something other than national, that it is supernational, and the Khilafat must be as dear to them as it is to us. Even now the King of the Hedjaz does not claim to be the Khalifa. When people began to address him as such he rebuked them, and he published in his official organ, "Al-Qibla," that he wanted to be called King of Hedjaz, and not Amire-ul-Muminin, a title reserved only for the Khalifa.

The PRIME MINISTER : What does that mean?

Mr. MOHAMED ALI : The Commander of the Faithful ; he commands them within the law of Islam and on behalf of God. He does not arrogate to himself a kingly function. I think, Sir, that will appeal to you personally—that the doctrine of the Khilafat is the doctrine of a Republic, and that, alone among all the Sovereigns of the world the one whose Coronation ceremony does not take place in a palace is the Khalifa. He has to go to the tomb of Hazrat Ayyoub Ansari, a Companion of the Prophet sent for the conquest of Constantinople, and there offer his prayers and gird the sword of Mohamed the Conqueror.

The PRIME MINISTER : Is it hereditary?

Mr. MOHAMED ALI : That is a point which will clear up the whole question of the Khalifa. Islam required temporal power for the defence of the Faith, and for that purpose, if the ideal combination

of piety and power could not be achieved, the Muslims said, "Let us get hold of the most powerful person, even if he is not the most pious, so long as he places his power at the disposal of our piety." That is why we agreed to accept Muslim Kings, the Omayyids and the Abbasids, as Khalifas, now the Sultans of Turkey. They have a peculiar succession of their own. We have accepted it for the time being because we must have the strongest Mussulman power at our disposal to assist us in the defence of the Faith. That is why we have accepted it. If the Turks agreed with other Muslims, and all agreed that the Khalifa may be chosen out of the humblest of any Muslim community, no matter who he was, the humblest of us might be chosen, as they used to be chosen in the days of the first four Khalifas, the Khulafa-i-Rashideen or truly guided Khalifas. In that case all the power of Islam could once more be put at the disposal of the most pious amongst us. If that happened, the Muslims would be overjoyed. But of course we have to make allowances for human nature. The Turkish Sultan in 1517 did not like to part with his power any more than the Mamluke rulers of Egypt liked to part with their power when they gave asylum to a scion of the Abbasids after the sack of Baghdad in 1258 A.D.

May I now sum up the claims we here put forward? If the Khalifa retains his wardenship of the Holy Places, which he can very well do if the exclusive control over every part of the Island of

Arabia is retained by the Khalifa himself, and if your own pledge, Sir, is redeemed in full, whilst the 12th point of the President of the United States on the basis of which the Armistice was concluded, is observed, then the result would be the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*, which Muslims claim as the irreducible minimum for the preservation of the Khilafat with adequate temporal power. Indian Muslims are anxious for reconciliation; reconciliation, and not revenge, should be your watchword also. Even if the Turks have been to blame in the past, Indian Muslims are more interested than any other body of people in seeing that such allegations as have been made against the Turks in the past should not be possible in the future. They mean to exercise their influence, which is sure to increase if a just and generous settlement is concluded with Turkey, to secure the future peace of the world, to secure a good government in Turkey, and to secure the reconciliation of Turkey with Great Britain and her Allies. As I said before, His Majesty has a very powerful lever in his Muslim subjects, which should be used far more extensively and effectively than it has been in the past.

I will say just one word with regard to the feeling in India, and then I will conclude, but I ask that my colleague, Mr. Syud Hossain be allowed to supplement what I have said on certain points that he may like to select.

The PRIME MINISTER: What has he got to

supplement? Surely you have put the whole case very fully?

Mr. MOHAMED ALI: I think I might leave him to explain to you the feeling that prevails in India at the present moment.

Mr. SYUD HOSSAIN: There is just one point I should like to clear up. When talking about Arabia you said to Mr. Mohamed Ali, "Then you are opposed to independence for Arabia?" and he said "Yes." I think that needs to be qualified a little. We are not opposed to the independence of Arabia. We are opposed to Emir Faisal's declaration of independence only for this reason—that Arabia, throughout the history of Islam, has up till now remained under the direct control of the Khalif. This is the first time in the history of Islam that any one who is not the Khalif has set up any claim over Arabia. That is why there is, from the Muslim point of view, a conflict of religious obligations with actual facts. We are not opposed to Arabian independence. On the contrary, we wish very much for complete autonomy in that region, but we want it to be in harmony and not in conflict with the Khilafat and its claims. The idea is not infeasible, as both Arabs and Turks are Muslims. I have only one other point to put before you, and that is in regard to the feeling in India at present. As you know this Delegation has been sent by the All-India Khilafat Conference, which is not a purely Muslim organisation. Besides Muslim it includes most of

the foremost leaders of the Hindu community also, and I should just like to state why it is that they are with us in this matter. There has been a very extraordinary growth of Hindu-Muslim unity in India in recent years, and it reached its climax, if I may say so, the moment the Hindus, after realising that this question really was a matter of the deepest concern to Muslims, came into this movement with us. I would just emphasise this—that until a decade or two back the tradition in India of Hindu and Muslims under British rule was to be separate. When the Indian National Congress was first founded, Muslims were almost openly opposed to the whole movement, but gradually Muslims came into Congress and gradually this national movement has been built up, until to-day we have this extraordinary fact—that Hindus and Mussulmans are identified and united in what is really a communal question. The point I should like to put before you is this ; We are on the eve of a new era in India. That is generally admitted. Here we have this solid fact of Hindu—Muslim unity. The British Empire is the greatest Muslim Power in the world, and if this question of “Jazirat-ul-Arab” which is, as we believe you are aware, a fundamentally religious question which has affected not anyone class or another of Muslims, but all classes, and in fact most of all those classes that are not ordinarily identified with domestic politics—if this question, which affects every single Muslim Unit in India, were solved in such a manner

that they might be sure that their religious obligations remained inviolate, then we should have within the British Empire this solid unity of Islam and India—I mean non-Muslim India—and for the British Commonwealth the friendship of the Muslim world. The world is undergoing very many phases of transformation, but if this Indo-Islamic-British unity could be achieved on a basis of reality and of real contentment all round it would certainly be a very splendid fulfilment of the destiny of the British Empire. That is all I have to say.

THE PRIME MINISTER: Gentlemen, you have put your case with very great lucidity and with moderation, and as the head of a Government which as the last speaker has very well said has to deal with an Empire which is the largest Mohameran Empire in the world, I feel bound to listen with great care to every thing that comes from our Mussulman fellow-subjects in any part of the Empire. When we were in Paris we took great care to consider the Mussulman representatives who came from India. They were represented in the first instance with very great force by two able Indians who were not Mohamedans, but who still were very much imbued with a sense of what was fair to their Mohamedan fellow-countrymen. The Maharajah of Bikanir and Lord Sinha repeatedly brought the case before the Delegation—a Delegation of the British Empire, not merely a Delegation of Great Britain, but of the Dominions as well. They formed a part of that Delegation

themselves. Then Delegations were arranged from Mohamedans, some resident in Great Britain, and some who came from India, and at my request the Supreme Council of the Allies heard their case. M. Clemenceau, Mr. President Wilson, Senor Orlando, and myself, representing the Great Powers of the Alliance, listened with great care to a very powerful presentation of the Mohamedan case in respect of Turkey. So that I should like the Mohamedans of India to feel that their case has been presented with great care and with great force, and has been listened to with conscientious care not merely by the delegates of the British Empire, but, at the request of the delegates of the British Empire, by the Supreme Council of the Allies. Whatever decision we came to, we arrived at after listening to and weighing very carefully all the arguments, all the facts, all the considerations and all the appeals which came from Mohamedans in every part of the world.

The second thing I want to say is this. I should like to get out of the mind of any Mussulman throughout the Empire that we are treating Turkey upon different principles to those we applied when we came to consider Christian countries. We were at war with three Christian countries and one Mohamedan country. We did not seek war with any of them. The governors of Turkey took upon themselves to wage war upon us. Nothing was further from our minds at the beginning of the conflict with

Germany than that we should have to make war with Turkey. I do not believe we have ever made war against Turkey. We have been fighting for Turkey many times. One of the greatest wars we ever waged was to save Turkey from the rapacity of Russia—I mean the Crimean War. In 1878 we very nearly went to war with Russia again on behalf of Turkey. We have never in my recollection waged war upon Turkey. There have been one or two small incidents which were inevitable, but we have never waged war upon Turkey. We have waged war for Turkey. We very nearly got engaged in another gigantic war for Turkey, but we have never fought Turkey. And Turkey at a moment when we were engaged in the most terrible struggle this country has ever been in, or which any other country has ever been in, suddenly declared war upon us. It was vital to us in the great struggle that we should have free access to the Black Sea. The fact that we had not got free access prolonged the war by at least two years. Turkey suddenly slammed the gates in the face of an old ally who had always stood by her and who had no quarrel with her of any sort or kind at that time. The governors of Turkey, Talaat Pasha and Enver Pasha, slammed the gates in our face and undoubtedly imperilled the whole cause of the Allies. I do not believe France has ever made war upon Turkey! I have no recollection of it. France has been quite friendly to Turkey. France was engaged on our side in the

Crimean War supporting Turkey, and the same thing happened to France. So I do not want any Mohamadan in India to imagine that we entered into this war against Turkey as a crusade against Islam.*

Nothing was further from our minds than to have a quarrel with Islam in any part of the world at that moment. Repeatedly during the war by every means in our power we did our best to bring it to an end by friendly means. Our quarrel was not with Turkey. Our death struggle was with Germany and the German Military Power, and we deeply regretted that the Young Turkish Party should have misled their country and brought Turkey into war with us. I do not believe Turkey really wanted to quarrel with Great Britain. I am talking now of the majority of the population of Turkey. As I say, we deeply regretted that their rulers should have misled their country into fighting with their old allies and friends—Great Britain. That is the position. But they insisted upon fighting with us. They insisted on slamming the door against us and

* Mr. Lloyd George, in one of his recent speeches, said :—
“The name of General Allenby will be ever remembered as that of the brilliant commander who fought and won the last and most triumphant of the crusades. It was his good fortune by his skill, to bring to a glorious end an enterprise which absorbed the chivalry of Europe for centuries. We forget now that the military strength of Europe was concentrated for generations upon this purpose in vain, and a British army under the command of General Allenby achieved it, and achieved it finally.”

thus prevented our getting through to help Rumania and Russia. By that means the war undoubtedly was prolonged for two years.

Now Turkey has been beaten. So has Germany. So has Austria fallen to pieces. She was an Empire. What is she now? She has fallen to bits, and her fragments are scattered about. But she is not a Mussulman country. She is a Christian country. Therefore it is no use talking about crusades. We have no crusade against Austria. She has paid the penalty of defeat. She has gone to pieces. What has happened in Germany? We have taken Alsace Lorraine away from Germany. The whole of Poland has been taken away from her, and we have imposed upon her very stern and severe terms. But she is a Christian country. She is not Mussulman. Why should we do it? Because we are applying the principle of self-determination to these countries which oppressed subject peoples and provoked war to destroy liberty throughout the world. In Austria the Czecho-Slovaks say: "We no longer want to remain under Austria." We say, "Very well; Austria has forfeited its title to Empire. We will make you independent" The Jugo-Slavs say the same thing. We say, "Very well, make a Government of your own with Serbia." Transylvania says the same thing, and we say, "Very well, you may unite with your fellow-self-determination to the subjects of the autocratic Empires. I do not want any Mussulman in India therefore to imagine that

we are applying one principle to Christians and another principle to Mohamedans. But neither do I want any Mussulman in India to imagine that we are going to abandon, when we come to Turkey, the principles which we have ruthlessly applied to Christian countries like Germany and Austria.

I do not understand Mr. Mohamed Ali to claim indulgence for Turkey. He claims justice, and justice she will get. Austria has had justice. Germany has had justice—pretty terrible justice. Why should Turkey escape? Turkey thought she had a feud with us. What feud had Turkey with us. Why did she come in to try and stab us and destroy liberty throughout the world when we were engaged in this life and death struggle? Is there any reason why we should apply a different measure to Turkey to that which we have meted out to the Christian communities of Germany and Austria? I want the Mohamedans in India to get it well into their minds that we are not treating Turkey severely because she is Mohamedan; we are applying exactly the same principle to her as we have applied to Austria, which is a great Christian community.

What are those principles? They are the principles of self-determination applied to Empires which have forfeited their title to rule. The Arabs have claimed independence. They have proclaimed Feisal King of Syria. They have claimed that they should be severed from Turkish dominion. Is it suggested that the Arabs should remain under

Turkish dominion merely because they are Mohamedans? Is not the same measure of independence and freedom to be given to Mohamedans as is given to Christians? Croatia has demanded freedom, and we have given it to her. It is a Christian community. Syria has demanded it and it is given to her. We are applying exactly the same principles in Christian places, and to impose the dominion of the Sultan upon Arabia, which has no desire for it, is to impose upon Arabs something which we certainly would not dream of imposing upon these Christian communities.

Now I come to the other points. One is Thrace. It is very difficult to get the facts about Thrace, but I have got before me here the Turkish census and the Greek census about Thrace. There is very little difference between them. According to both of these, the Mussulman population in Thrace is in a considerable minority. If that is true and the principle of self-determination is to be applied, the whole of Thrace would certainly be taken away from Turkish rule. Take Smyrna. The same thing applies there. We had a most careful investigation by a very impartial Committee into the whole of the question of the Province of Smyrna. We found that a considerable majority of the population was non-Turk. There were Mussulmans, there who were Greeks. But the great majority of the population undoubtedly prefer Greek rule to Turkish rule, so I understand.

What is the other case which is put? It is the question of the temporal power of the Khalif. The question of the temporal power of a spiritual head is not confined to Islam, as Mr. Mohamed Ali knows very well. It is one of the great controversies of Christendom too. We have had here one of the most fierce controversies, which raged for over a generation, as to the temporal power of the head of the Roman Catholic Church. There are Roman Catholics who believe in it, and there are Roman Catholics who do not believe in it. I am not going to express any opinion. But after the Pope was deprived of his temporal power his spiritual power was as great as and very likely greater than ever. I know of Mohamedans, sincere, earnest, zealous Mussulmans, who take a very different view of the temporal power to the one which is taken by Mr. Mohamed Ali to-day, just as I know of Catholics who take one view and other Catholics who take a very different view of the temporal power of the Pope. That is a controversy into which I do not propose to enter. All I know is this. The Turk will exercise temporal power in Turkish lands. Neither do we propose that he should retain power over lands which are not Turkish. Why? Because that is the principle we are applying to the Christian communities of Europe. The same principles must be applied to the Turk.

As to the Armenian massacres, there is no doubt about them. Mr. Mohamed Ali says there has

not been an impartial investigation. That is true ; because the worst massacres of all occurred during the war, and there was no one to investigate. I quote, however, the reply given by the Turkish emissaries in Paris, the representatives of the Turkish Government, on the subject. Their sole answer was that the Committee of Union and Progress, who were in power at that time and ordered the massacre of the Armenians, had also committed crimes against Moslems, and condemned to death by every means 3,000,000 of Moslems. That is no answer. It is not a question of punishment ; it is a question of good government ; and whether it is 800,000 Christians or 3,000,000 Moslems, a Government which cannot protect its own subjects, whether they are Christians or Moslems against wholesale massacres of that kind is not fit to govern. Therefore we are bound, in the interests of civilisation, to exercise some sort of control and supervision. It is quite clear that the Turkish Government is incapable, as at present constituted, of protecting its own subjects. Let us take the facts. The Turk is not such a very old Government in Asia Minor. We talk as if the Turk had always been the owner of Asia Minor. He has not. All we know is that it is a very badly governed country. It was once a very rich country. It was a country which was not only rich, but it enriched other lands. It is rich no longer. It is devastated ; it is desolate. You must take that into account. Here is a bad farmer in a

farm which is essential to the world. At one time it was the granary of the Mediterranean. It is so no longer. You really cannot allow them to desolate and to devastate this country without some sway on the part of the civilised countries of the world in the matter. The Turk has no right to say "This is my country, and if I like to desolate it that is my business." No country has a right to do that. It is not a question of race ; it is not a question of Christian ; it is not a question of Moslem. If there had been Christians there who had devastated a great country like this, which is essential to the world, we should have said exactly the same thing. Here is Europe suffering from scarcity. We are so interdependent, not merely European countries, upon each other, but Europe upon Asia and Asia upon Europe, that we have all got an interest in seeing that large tracts of territory are not laid waste by misgovernment. That is our common interest in control in Asia Minor. If the Turk were a capable and efficient administrator, who looked after his land well, there is not a Christian community in Europe that would not say : "God bless you and prosper you," and we would not dream of interfering. We should be glad to see him work out his own faith in his own land. But I do not think he has governed in a way which makes Islam proud of him. I will ask you to look at the way in which he has done it. Is Islam really proud of Turkish dominion?

All I want to say in conclusion is this. I want

to give this feeling to the Mussulmans of India who stood loyally by the Throne and by the Empire with very few exceptions—and there were exceptions even amongst Christians. Therefore I draw no distinction to the detriment of the Mussulmans of India because there were some amongst them who were disloyal. There were Christians who were also disloyal, and therefore I do not say this in the slightest degree as a criticism of Mohamedanism. The Mussulmans of India stood by the Throne and the Empire. We gratefully acknowledge it. They helped us in the struggle. We willingly and gladly recognise that. We recognise that they have a right to be heard in a matter which affects especially Islam. We have heard them. Not merely have we heard them but we have very largely deferred to their wishes in the matter. The settlement was very largely deferred to their wishes in the matter. The settlement was very largely affected by the opinion of India and especially the Mussulmans of India. But we cannot apply different principles in the settlement of a Mohamedan country to those which we sternly applied in our settlement with the Christian communities with whom we were also at war.

That is all I have to say, and I thank you for putting your case before me and putting it so clearly.

MR. MOHAMED ALI: May I make just one or two observations? I will say one word with regard to the Turkish declaration of war. Really

we are not charged either to defend it or to say anything about it ; but one consideration I think should be before His Majesty's Government. It was not a case merely of Great Britain and the Turkish Empire. After all, there was a great alliance, and the Turks may have—I do not say that they had this in view—been alarmed by the fact that the Tsar of Russia, their ancient enemy, was one of the allies of Great Britain. I am absolutely certain that no Turk would have dreamed of going to war with England or with France if it had been merely a case of England or France.

THE PRIME MINISTER: I want to make it absolutely clear that we had no understanding of any sort or kind with Russia, when we entered into the war, to the detriment of Turkey—none. There was no discussion, as far as I know upon the subject, and I am absolutely certain there was no agreement, either secret or open, when we entered into the war.* So that Turkey had no reason to fear anything from our having engaged in a war on the side of Russia. Our war was against Germany, and we had not Turkey in our minds in the least.

MR. MOHAMED ALI: With reference to these crimes and atrocities, we come back again after all to this. All the case for depluming the Turks rests

* Compare Mr. Lloyd George's Manchester speech:—
“ When I came into office in 1915 I found a series of agreements with Russia, France, Italy and Greece which completely partitioned Turkey.”

upon this that the Turk has been intolerant and a bad and inept ruler.

The PRIME MINISTER : An inefficient ruler.

MR. MOHAMED ALI : Well, Sir, in that case I think I shall be discharging the duty which have been laid upon us by our people by merely saying that, with regard to our religious obligations, it is not possible to compromise. We have our duties to our faith in matters of that kind. Our obligations are there and must be respected at all times. You will not find one Mussulman I do not know to what exceptions you particularly referred we have no access to the Government's records but there was no Mussalman in India who wantonly betrayed the allegiance that he owed to His Majesty. Mussalmans have obligations imposed on them by their religion, and their loyalty to His Majesty is entirely conditioned by perfect freedom in matters of their faith. We have been charged with the duty of putting the case before you with regard to the preservation of the temporal power of the Khalifa, with regard to the Khalifa's wardenship of the Holy Places, and with regard to exclusive Muslim control. We explained that to the Viceroy and we explained that to Mr. Fisher when he received us. With reference to these matters we have our religious obligations, and we must always place these first.

The PRIME MINISTER : I do not think we can reopen this ; otherwise we might go on all night.

MR. MOHAMED ALI : I thank you on behalf of

the Delegation for having received us. We shall communicate what you have said to our people.

(The Delegation then withdrew).

MR. LLOYD GEORGE AND THE INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION.

The reply given by Mr. Lloyd George to the members of the Indian Khalifat Delegation, who waited on him on the 19th March to present the demands for the preservation of the territorial integrity of the Khilafat made by the 72 millions of His Majesty's Indian Muslim subjects with the entire sympathy and support of their more than 200 millions Hindu compatriots, was extremely disappointing, ill-advised, and regrettable. It is full of equivocations, misrepresentations, and misstatements. It evades the real issues and betrays, on the part of the Prime Minister, a lamentable lack of realisation of the Imperial responsibilities that rest on his shoulders as the head of the Government of this great Empire.

The case of the Delegation was very simple and clear. They approached the question of the future of the Turkish Empire not as a Turkish or an Arab question ; but as a Muslim question, a question that vitally affected the clearest and some of the most essential injunctions of their faith. They took their stand on their religion and claimed a decisive voice in the matter on the basis of the perfect freedom in

matters of faith guaranteed to the Muslims of India by the Proclamation of 1858 and subsequently confirmed by King Edward VII and King George V. They referred to texts in the Quran and the traditions of the Prophet in support of their threefold demands for the preservation of the temporal power of the Khalifa, adequate for the defence of the Faith, which involved the restoration of the *status quo ante bellum*, the Khalifa's wardenship of the Holy Places of Islam and the Exclusive Muslim Control of the "Island of Arabia" as delimited by Muslim scholars. In his reply to this threefold demands, therefore, the Prime Minister should have essayed the veracity of the statement of the Delegation regarding perfect religious freedom and the requirements of the Islamic law with regard to the exclusive Muslim control over the "Island of Arabia" and the temporal power of the Khalifa. That, to our mind, was the right and the proper way of dealing with the question, for the entire Muslim case is based on the validity of that statement. If its validity is once established, as we maintain it is, we do not see how the demands of the Muslims of India can be rightly refused.

The Premier, however, did not follow this line in his reply. He did make just a slight reference to "Mahomedans, sincere, earnest, zealous Mussulmans, who take a very different view of the temporal power (of the Khalifa) from the one which is taken by Mr. Mohamed Ali to-day. . . ." That

is the single instance in which he followed the right line of argument. But the assertion that he makes cannot be true ; for, it is a fact that there is not one single sect in Islam which subscribes to that view. Even the Shias, who do not believe in the present Khalifah, require that power for their Imam and valiantly sacrificed their lives for the supremacy of Ali and Hussain (may the peace of God be upon them both) in the past. We should, therefore, like to know the identity and credentials of these "Mahomedans" who hold "a very different view." Mr. Lloyd George cannot be unaware of the miserable fate of the attempt of some Government servants in Sind to induce by threats and offers of honour some Mussulmans to invent such "different views". They succeeded for some time in getting these "different views" held to order, but as soon as the threats were removed the persons forced to hold them recanted every word in public. The incident is eloquent in itself and shows how views can be manufactured to order. It is quite probable that views referred to by the Premier have a similar parentage.

With the exception of this isolated instance, the Premier takes a tangential view of the question, and bases his entire case on the application of the principle of self-determination which involves the dismemberment of Turkey. He repudiates the idea of treating Turkey severely because she is Mahomedan. He does "not want any Maho-

medan in India to imagine that we entered into this war against Turkey as a crusade against Islam". We shall come to the weakness of his main case and the inaccurate and misleading statements with which he tried to support it later on. At this stage we should like to point out that if the Muslims in India not only imagine, but seriously believe, that it was the crusading spirit with which the war against the Turks was prosecuted, he has to blame himself and his colleagues, for did he not hail Lord Allenby as the hero who had achieved what the combined might of Christendom had failed to achieve during its struggle of centuries? And did not Mr. Churchill actually say that it was a crusade against the Turks? This is taking the statements of responsible Ministers only. The statements of other prominent men are too many and too pronounced to require any special notice. Coming to the question of self-determination on which Mr. Lloyd George relies in his reply we have to point out that he is guilty of a gross, we almost feel impelled to say deliberate, mis-statement. May we ask if the principle of self-determination is applied or proposed to be applied to Syria, to Cilicia, to Yamen, which has already willingly and voluntarily elected and sent its two delegates to the Turkish Chamber of Deputies?

Has it been applied to Egypt, which was a part of the Turkish Empire, and has expressed its unanimous desire for independence in unmistakable accents?

How does the Premier reconcile the vivisection of Syrians and the mandates for Syria and the Protectorate over Egypt with the principle of self-determination to which he so persistently and vehemently appeals? Why does he conveniently ignore Palestine and Mesopotamia, and how does he reconcile the proposed settlement of Mesopotamia and Palestine with his self-determination? Why should non-Muslim control be established in these Muslim regions? Or is it that oilfields and Islam cannot go with the principle of self-determination?

Again, if he is so anxious to apply the principle of self-determination to each and every hamlet of Armenia, why should he deprive the Turks of their right to self-determination? Why should he "exercise. . . control and supervision" over them in their lands, too? Surely they, too, are men, and not less entitled to what they are required to agree to for others.

It is not that we are opposed to the principle of self-determination that we put all these questions. Nor is the Indian Khilafat Delegation opposed to that principle. In fact they agree to full autonomy and right of free development of all non-Turkish races within the Turkish Empire as embodied in the fourteen points of President Wilson, to which the Allies were pledged when they signed the Armistice with the Turks. We only want to point out the inaccuracy of the statement of Mr. Lloyd George and show that it is proposed to deprive the Mussul-

mans of these regions of their freedom and to carry on aggressive Imperialistic designs under the cover of self-determination.

But these are not the only inaccuracies and mis-statements of which Mr. Lloyd George has been guilty. He says "I have got before me the Turkish census and the Greek census about Thrace. According to both of these, the Muslim population in Thrace is in a considerable minority", and therefore he proposes to treat the promise he gave to Indian Mussalmans regarding Asia Minor, Constantinople and Thrace as a scrap of paper, and take away the whole of Thrace from Turkish rule. It is difficult to believe that the Premier was really serious when he solemnly represented "Muslim population in Thrace in a considerable minority", and that, too, on the basis of the Turkish census. We have before us a copy of the Memorandum communicated by the Sublime Porte to the American, British, French and Italian High Commissioners on February 12, 1919, which contains the Turkish official census for Thrace. This Turkish official census gives the percentage of Muslims and Greeks in Thrace as 62.6 and 26.9 respectively. We should like to request the Premier to divulge the mathematical secret by which he reduced this majority of 62.6 per cent., into a "considerable minority". Let us be honest and do away with hypocrisy.

He is in an equally indefensible position when

he comes to Smyrna, where, he asserts, the great non-Greek and Muslim majority prefers Greek rule, in spite of, or perhaps, because of, the wholesale massacres carried on by the Greeks, all accounts of which, for one reason or another, are suppressed.

The whole reply of the Premier then resolves itself into this that the decision of the Allies regarding the Turkish peace settlement cannot be altered. France shall have a mandate for Syria and probably Cilicia, Italy for Adalia and hinterland, Greece for Smyrna and hinterland, Palestine shall be a Jewish home, Mesopotamia shall be assigned to England, Thrace shall be taken away from Turkish rule and perhaps given to Greece, Constantinople shall be divided between the Turks and the Allies, and the Turks shall not enjoy full sovereignty even in Asia Minor, as they will have to submit to alien economic control, for the principle of self-determination is to be applied to them. As if this were not absurd enough, he actually adds that all this is to be done after deferring to the wishes of the Mussalmans of India !

We shudder to think what would have been the fate of these poor Muslims, being deprived of their independence in the name of self-determination, if no deference had been paid to Indian Muslim views. If this be the result of the sympathies of Indian Muslim friends of these unhappy people, well may they say, "God save us from our friends."

INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION AT ESSEX HALL.

The meeting at the Essex Hall on Tuesday, March 23rd, 1920, to hear the members of the Indian Khilafat Delegation, was a great success, thanks to the organising work of Mr. Arthur Field, the Secretary of the Anglo-Ottoman Society. It is right that Mussalmans all over the world should recognise a debt of gratitude to Mr. Field, who even during the war fought hard to overcome the prejudice which existed against Turkey in the British Labour Party, and indeed wherever it appeared. His name must be honoured by us among the few who, like Pierre Loti, never wavered in the cause of right even when Turkey, being technically, an "enemy," was most unpopular. At the Essex Hall meeting Mr. Field did not appear upon the platform, but we take this occasion of testifying that the success of the meeting was entirely due to his disinterested work. The hall was filled with an enthusiastic audience.

The chair was occupied by Mr. Marmaduke Pickthall, President of the Society, and in addition to the members of the Delegation, Messrs. Mohamed Ali, Syud Hossain, and Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nadvi, there were present on the platform Dr. Abdul Majid of the Islamic Society, Mr. J. M. Parikh representing the British Committee of the Indian National Congress and the Indian Christian Community, Mr. M. T. Kaderbhoy, a Shiah gentleman representing the Anjumani Zia-ul-Islam of Bombay,

Mr. B. G. Horniman, Editor "Bombay Chronicle," Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, the Indian poet, representing the Hindus of India, Mr. Leland Buxton, Mr. Arnold Lupton, and Mr. Douglas Fox Pitt.

THE CHAIRMAN: Ladies and gentlemen, this meeting was arranged before Mr. Lloyd George received the Indian Khilafat Delegation, and made his remarkable reply to them. I must say, as one who can claim to be an authority on the Turkish problem, having been acquainted with the problems of Turkey and the peoples of the Turkish Empire, and studied them for 25 years I do not suppose Mr. Lloyd George has studied them for 25 minutes—that I was ashamed and very sad to read that answer in an English newspaper. It contained statements that any Orientalist can traverse, and it contained downright misrepresentations. (Cheers). We who have been fighting for years to save the tie of loyalty and mutual affection which exists between England and her Eastern Empire cannot take so ill-informed a reply as representative of the mind of England and as an absolutely final answer on an important a question. (Hear, hear.) As you know, Czarist Russia was for centuries the villain of the Turkish question, and in the old days, England as the friend of liberty and progress, used occasionally to protect the Turks from Russian villainy. Then there arose a school of politicians here who had the vision of a re-united Christendom which should dominate, convert, and exploit non-Christian peoples in the world,

and they saw in Holy Russia the chief means of realising it. Their plan was very fine, no doubt, from their point of view, but it was absolutely incompatible with the welfare and prolonged existence of a British Empire based upon religious tolerance. You can see the result of it to-day—on the one hand a League of Nations, Christian nations bent on spoliation, and on the other hand the British Empire seething with discontent, estranged and misgoverned. From the moment England turned her back upon her great traditions, and became attached to Russia, Turkey has had foul play and calumny from us. The whole Eastern world knows that, but the British public have been kept in the dark about it. Our Russian alliance was exceedingly offensive to all Oriental subjects of the British Empire. There is no doubt about that. The British Government itself became aware of it, and having tacitly and in principal accepted Russian policy, which included the destruction of the Turkish Empire, they evolved a series of insane and reckless projects which I imagine were suggested to our doctrinaires by some of the Czar's Oriental experts, with a view of course, to gratify the Muslims. The result of our wartime propaganda against Turkey upon the people it was meant to please was such that the authorities in India and in Egypt had to give assurances contradicting that propaganda, to keep the people quiet even while Czarist Russia survived. When Czarist Russia fell, there was intense relief. Mr. Lloyd

George's speech of January 5, 1918, was received as an earnest of a change of policy. It kept the people quiet until the beginning of 1919, when it was known that Mr. Lloyd George in Paris was ignoring his own solemn promise. The landing at Smyrna and the murder and devastation which follow caused a thrill of horror. From that time onward the people of India have been claiming their right as Oriental subjects of the British Empire to have their views upon an Oriental question which affects them far more closely than any native of these islands, strongly and effectively expressed by the representatives of that Empire, and by no other representatives. (Cheers.) What is that they ask? Simply that England shall fulfil the solemn promise that she made to British subjects in preference to the compacts made with foreigners. If preference is given to the foreigner, membership of the British Empire has no value for the people of India. The Turkish regions, Thrace, Constantinople, Anatolia must be left to Turkish sovereignty as England promised India that they should be. There is another demand, less generally understood, also connected with a promise made by England. The question of the Khilafat, we are assured, will not be interfered with, but the question of the Khilafat cannot be separated from the question of the Muslim Holy Land, the Holy Land of all monotheistic religions including as it does Palestine and a part of Mesopotamia. That land must be in Muslim keeping

under the Khalifah. If any part of it is torn away the Muslim world must fight for its recovery. The Khalifah's jurisdiction over that territory does not preclude complete autonomy and right of self-government for the inhabitants, nor does it preclude the existence of local rulers of considerable power and dignity. It is in fact very largely a question of status and terminology. You may consider this demand, as Mr. Lloyd George did, as strange, absurd, and even impudent. We conquered Palestine and Mesopotamia without India, without Egypt? Could we hold Palestine and Mesopotamia in the future without India, without Egypt? (Cheers.) Then if you are Christians, you will say Palestine is our Holy Land. Well, if you wish to keep it holy, leave it to the Muslims. If you wish for factories and sweated labour, cinema shows and cafe chantants in Jerusalem, then take it away from the Khalifah and the Sacred Law. The Delegation has come to warn us that the Empire is in danger. Whatever you may think of what they have to tell you, we must all admire their courage in coming here among us so simply and so sincerely on so dangerous an errand, for the danger of which they will speak is so great and imminent that at any moment they may find themselves cut off from a return to India—hostages in the hands of an angry British Government. (Loud Applause.)

MR. MOHAMED ALI: I have come here in the heart of democracy from a part of the world which

has been somewhat notorious for its autocratic ways even in the twentieth century. But I have found it very difficult to realise the great change that 7,000 miles of land and sea should have made. We found that a propaganda had been carried on here for a long time past by the enemies of the Turk. We could afford neither the money nor the morals for a similar propaganda in favour of our views. But something had to be done. The message with which we were charged had to be delivered; the warning which was entrusted to our hand to be conveyed. We found very few indeed who could sympathise with the Turks, for, not only have the Turks fallen to-day on evil times, but, what is worse, they have also fallen on evil tongues. Of course, there are Englishmen who know the Turks and they all sympathise with them. I have not yet come across a man who has fought against the Turks who does not speak well of them. (Hear, hear). But there is the large mass of stay-at-home Britons who do not know the Turk at all, and harbour the prejudices so sedulously sought by his enemies to be eternally perpetuated. In these circumstances people have come to us and said: "Do not put your demands too hinge. Do not rub the English people the wrong way. If you go to them wearing the mantle of moderation you will succeed." I asked myself: "Am I really living in the land of democracy to-day where those in authority have to take their politics from the people, or in a land of

autocrats where hundreds of millions of people have to take their politics from a handful of alien autocrats?" (Hear, hear.) When we arrived in this country we were asked not to represent the views which we had been sent to represent, but to chime in with the views and fancies of the autocrats in high quarters. Well, ladies and gentlemen, I decided that I would not "moderate"—they are moderate enough in all conscience—the claims of our people, but to deliver the message with which we have been charged. I am not going to hurl our mandate at you ; I am prepared to reason with you to argue with you, to explain to you as clearly as I can, what is not clear, what is new, and what is on the face of it startling, and I hope I may rely on the ancient English tradition of fair play and an open mind. (Cheers.) Imperialists, exploiters, and people with axes to grind are leading up to a most serious situation in the British Empire. If you value the Empire you will give us a patient hearing, and carefully consider what we have to say. In certain quarters efforts have been made to belittle the Delegation. Ladies and gentlemen, I will tell you who we are and whom we represent. We have been sent to this country by the All-India Khilafat Conference, the largest and most representative national body in India of recent times. The Indian National Congress and the Muslim League are large and important political bodies, but the body we represent is larger and more comprehensive than these.

Twenty thousand Hindus and Mussalmans attended the third session of the All-India Khilafat Conference that has sent this Delegation and its proceedings lasted from 6 o'clock in the evening to two next morning and I have never in my experience of Indian meetings seen anything like the enthusiasm that marked these proceedings. And what is happening now? Telegrams of approbation have arrived from all over India, for example, one representing a great meeting of 15,000 in a comparatively small place like Chittagong, to mention only one. It is the people who have sent us here and not an unrepresentative officialdom. As to our antecedents, some of us have certainly suffered imprisonment without any kind of trial at all, but merely on the letters de cachet of the executive, for purely religious activities, and, indeed, in India the law has been so administered that the best of men have been forced to regard imprisonment as an honour. Need I appeal in your country to your past history? Have not the Pym and Hampdens of England suffered to secure the liberties of which Englishmen are so proud? I ask you Englishmen and Englishwomen not to deprive us also of the right to be heard on behalf of our people merely because your representatives in India deprived us of our liberties. (Cheers.) - Mr. Lloyd George said in Downing Street last Friday that he had consulted representative Muslim opinion, and shown the greatest consideration and deference to your Indian

fellow-subjects. I should like to know whom the Government have heard. Not one of the seventy millions of Indian Mussulmans was represented at the Peace Conference. Lord Sinha, a personal friend of mine, for whom I have the greatest respect and affection, if not veneration, does not represent the mind of India to-day. If the Government believes it has secured two sets of opinions from India, let it publish what the second and unknown section has really said at the Peace Conference. The real voice of India was stifled. When a man was thought likely to say something undesirable he was interned. Journals were suppressed, plants were threatened and no newspaper truly representing the views of Indian Mussulmans was allowed to exist. I can give the names of a dozen newspapers that had an average life of not more than six months, not because there was no reading public to appreciate their views, but because the reading public appreciated those views only too well. They were shut out from province after province under the Indian D. O. R. A., and then came down the Sword of Democles, the Press Act, which was admittedly based on an Austrian model, if you please. My own English weekly, the "Comrade," was thus suppressed, for the security that has to be given for "good behaviour" at the very outset by every journalist for his paper and his Press, as if he was a confirmed criminal, was declared forfeited on account of the publication of an article that was being praised by

the "Morning Post," the "Daily Telegraph," and the "New Statesman" here almost on the very day that the Order of forfeiture was issued in India. My Urdu daily, the "Hamdard," was strangled by the pre-censorship that was set up under D.O.R.A., although it had been praised for its excellent tone during the war by the same official that now killed it without the least previous warning. I mention these two only as typical instances, and not because I was singled out for such repression. The same policy was followed with regard to Muslim public men. They were interned under D.O.R.A., and even imprisoned. One of the leading and most respected religious authorities, one of the greatest religious divines, Maulana Mahmud Hasan Sahib, of the famous religious seminary of Deoband, which had been thoroughly intimidated into flabby submission to the powers that be, an old man of seventy had to leave India after our internment, because he feared he would be required to sign something in the name of religion, as so many others had been required, that his conscience entirely abhorred. He migrated to Mecca, the sanctuary where, at least, Muslim conscience expected to be safe from outrage and coercion. But although he escaped from India, he could not escape the demand that he feared. He naturally refused to comply. And what was the result? He was arrested in the very sanctuary of Islam through the Shareef and deported to Egypt.

Perhaps it was feared that the mere presence

of an honest and conscientious man would cast its spell over the Egyptians, he was removed to Malta, and is still kept there in spite of the recent Royal Proclamation ; and at one time complaints were heard that he and his party were underfed. I do not know whether the same treatment is continued or not, but I know this, that some sort of a conditional offer of release was made to him which was refused, in the words of Joseph, in the Chapter of the Quran of that name, "O, Lord, prison is dearer to me than that to which they invite me." The whole of Muslim India indignantly protests against such an outrage, and if his release is not ordered immediately, the consequences will be of the gravest nature.

My own internment and that of my brother resulted, on Mr. Montagu's arrival in India, in a revival of the protests that had continually been made before, and he was deluged with about a hundred thousand telegrams, all received in a single day, demanding our release. It would be very agreeable to us, indeed, if we could honestly regard all this as a personal tribute to us. But that we cannot. It is a tribute rather to the Khilafat, with which we expressed and promoted sympathy, as we were bound by our faith to do. If this is a matter of reproach in the estimation of the "Times," all I can say is that to us and to our friends and relations it is, and will continue to be, a matter of pride. These are our "irreproachable antecedents" and this our "unquestionable and high standing."

What is more, the very people whom the "Times" would credit with such antecedents and such standing are fully supporting us to-day, and men that cannot yet be called, "politically minded" are religious-minded enough to say to us. "God bless you, and prosper you."

We are therefore entitled to say that we represent the people of India on this question. Two of us have been journalists who assisted in voicing Indian opinion and have been sent here because we were not unfamiliar with British politics. But our people have sent along with us an Oriental scholar and divine of great eminence to represent the Ulema of India, since the issue, so far as we are concerned, is a religious one, and it was necessary to have adequate representation of religious bodies in India. More men would have come with us but time was passing and it was decided to send the first batch at once. Others are shortly expected and many more would follow if the Indian claims can secure a hearing. So much for our credentials although I should have thought that no question of this kind would arise after our cordial reception by His Excellency the Viceroy, whose Government facilitated our departure for Europe and America.

And now about the character of our Mission. We are sometimes asked why it is that we who are not Turks and have had no political or racial association with them, have come all this way to interest ourselves in the Turkish Settlement. We hold no

brief for the Turks but are the advocates of Indian claims. We speak not for the Turks but speak for ourselves. And here I must explain the nature and scope of Islam which makes this not a Turkish but an Islamic question. Islam does not recognise geographical and racial barriers such as the nationalism of modern Europe has set up in the way of the freest human intercourse and the widest human sympathies. In a word, it is not national but supernational. We do not worship in the shrines of a nationalism that has for its creed "My country right or wrong." (Cheers.) And one would have thought that after this horrible war, in which human ingenuity was taxed to its furthest capacity to devise means, not for the preservation, but for the destruction of the mankind, a war that was clearly the only logical conclusion of the cult of nationalism, it was time Europe ceased to worship this Moloch of modern Nationalism. To the Mussulmans of India the Turk is not only a man, but a brother, and that not because he shares with us a common domicile or a common parentage—things that can and do distinguish breeds of dogs and horses from other breeds—but because he shares with us a common outlook on life and common institutions and laws that materialise that outlook and perpetuate the culture of Islam. (Cheers.) The Turk and we are alike charged with a mission for the uplift of mankind and claim to be the heirs of all the ages and of all the Prophets.

We may have hitherto failed in our mission ; we may have betrayed the great Divine trust. But while you may condemn us and look upon us, the mission that we have been charged with by Islam cannot be looked down upon and condemned. It is clear that I am no "apologist" for Islam. There is nothing to "apologise" for, and if we attempt an "apology for Islam" we lose the entire case at once. If you will permit the use of the phrase in a friendly way, far from apologising the Islam we have to carry the war "into the enemy's own country." But what a war? Not a war of poison gas, or Dreadnoughts or Tanks or Howitzers, but a war of reason, of persuasion, of influencing you with whatever we have of nobility and goodness and charity, for the Quran lays it down clearly and emphatically that "There is no compulsion in faith." Well, ladies and gentlemen, I was explaining why it was that we are interested in this so-called Turkish Settlement. I have told you that Islam is super-national and not national, that the basis of Islamic sympathy is not a common domicile or common parentage, but a common outlook on life and common culture. And the embodiment of that common culture is the Khilafat. Islam is not a bundle of dogmas and doctrines that theologians plague humanity with. It is a complete scheme of life, a perfect code of right conduct and a comprehensive social polity as wide as the human race and in fact as wide as the entire creation. And it has

two centres. The personal centre is the Khalifa and the local centre is the island of Arabia, the Sanctuary of Islam, the Land of the Prophets. The Khalifa is the Commander of the Faithful and his commands must be obeyed by all Muslims so long, and so long only, as they are not at variance with the Commands of God and the Traditions of His Prophet. But since there is to be no lacerating distinction between things temporal and things spiritual, the Khalifa is something more than a Pope and cannot be "Vaticanised." But he is also less than the Pope, for he is not infallible and in all matters in which Mussulmans cannot see eye to eye with him the final arbiter is Allah Himself and we must refer back to the Quran and the Traditions of the Prophet. We are not therefore at his mercy and human conscience is still free. In fact, if he persists in un-Islamic conduct we can depose him, and have deposed him more than once. But so long as he orders only that which Islam demands we must support him. He and no other ruler is the Defender of our Faith. (Cheers.)

And now a word about "temporal power." Since Islam is not a thing for Sundays and Sabbaths only or for Fridays only, if you prefer that, the Khalifa is not there merely to repeat his beads. His chief function has always been the defence of our faith, and it would be curious indeed if, when Christendom had apparently discarded the Sermon on the Mount from its political code, and it was not

the meek that inherited the Kingdom of the Earth, Islam should be asked to defend itself by turning the left cheek to him who smote the right cheek. All that a Muslim is and all that a Muslim has, including physical prowess, are part of a Divine trust to be spent in serving God and carrying out His purposes, and no Mussulman can keep back anything required for the defence of Islam without gross betrayal of that Divine trust. If force ceased to be used in settling the affairs of mankind the Muslim would be the first to surrender his arms, and turn his sword and scimitar into a ploughshare. (Cheers.) But what do we see to-day? Viscount Bryce wants the Allies to use the argument of the "Big Stick" against the Khilafat. It is true that he says Orientals can understand no other argument. Now, could that object being, a mere Oriental, ask his Lordship what other argument he thinks the Occidental understands? We shall say nothing about the Allies, and we are on less dangerous ground if we refer to Germans and Austrians and Bolsheviks. Are these not of the West Western, and what argument other than that of the "Big Stick" did they understand? Is Germany converted to the pursuit of peace by his Lordship's eloquence, or by the "Bigger Stick" of the Allies? (Laughter.) Well, so long as there are your Bryces and your "Big Sticks," we, too must have some sort of a stick for the defence of our faith, and to jeopardise at least the dominance of those that jeopardise the freedom of our conscience.

(Cheers.) That, and that alone, is the rational of our main claim that the Khilafat should be preserved with adequate temporal power. (Cheers.) But if you think you can please the Mussalmans of India by allowing the Turks to retain Constantinople in such a way that the Khalifa is worse than the Pope at the Vatican—the Pope at Avignon—and, in fact, worse, for he would be the prisoner of people of an alien race and faith, then, ladies and gentlemen, you know very little of Islam and the Mussalmans, or of India and the Indians. (Cheers.) That affront shall never be tolerated, and if you think that by placarding the fact that Indian Muslim soldiers have been dragooned into this wretched business, you can make out that all this “agitation” is “fictitious” and “factitious,” then you will be compelling the Indian Muslim soldiery to disprove this lie in a manner that will be far too unambiguous for your tastes or for ours. Beware, beware, (Cheers.)

The first claim of the Indian Mussulmans I have already stated. It is that the Khilafat should be preserved with temporal power adequate for the defence of the Faith, and the irreducible minimum that is the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*, while taking guarantees from Turkey consequently with her independence and dignity as a Sovereign State for security of life and property and opportunities of autonomous development of all races, Christian, Muslim, and Jew. This is a region in which compromise was possible and we have

made it. This is not the best but by a long way the second best. We ask, after the remorseless spoliation of Turkey for centuries, which deprived her of territories in Europe and in Africa, including the "shameless brigandage" in Tripoli, as it was characterised by the Allies of Italy themselves, are we not most moderate in claiming that the remnant of territory and power left to Turkey after the Balkan War should be left to her and to Islam? There was a time when the great statesmen of Europe and America, and particularly President Wilson, spoke as if a new heaven and a new earth were to be created after this war, and if the restoration of Alsace-Lorraine is an act of justice surely the restoration of the territories torn from Turkey in Europe and of Tripoli to the Arabs if not to the Turks and of Egypt to the Egyptians if not to the suzerian Power must be regarded as an act of bare justice. But we do not ask for that, though we are in hearty sympathy with the claim of our brethren in those parts for undisturbed self-determination. What we ask for is after all so little that people who used to insist on a two-keels-to-one standard cannot but regard as extremely moderate. The power of Germany is broken, while the Allies are still strong. Do they fear a Turkish menace as they used to fear a German menace? That is not thinkable. England may have lost a good many things, but surely she has not lost her sporting instinct, and she could not have lost her nerve to the extent of insisting on com-

plete destruction of Turkey for her own safety. Not by such tremours are great Empires won and retained.

Our second claim is that the Island of Arabia, the fourth boundary being the Euphrates and the Tigris, should remain in exclusive Muslim control, and since it would be idle to suggest your handing over some other territory to the Khalifa, for the preservation of the Khilafat, that main claim of ours necessitates that this entire region which includes Syria, Palestine, and Mesopotamia should remain within the scheme of Ottoman Sovereignty. For the most part it is a barren tract, though even at this distance we can smell the oil that is attracting you to Mesopotamia as it attracted you to the Persian Gulf. The Holiest of Holies lies in an "unclutivable valley." But every grain of sand of that sacred soil is dearer to us than tons of gold, and we who claim to be the true successors of Abraham, of Moses and of Jesus on all of whom be peace and God's benedictions as we claim to be the successors of the Last of the Prophets on whom be peace and God's benedictions are charged with keeping this land safe for Theocracy and the worship of One God. Even if the Turks were to tolerate any form of non-Muslim control over any part of this region the Indian Mussulmans and Mussulmans of the rest of the world would still have to fight and die for keeping the sanctity of this soil inviolable. But if you fear that India is vulnerable from the Persian

Gulf the security that you seek does not lie in the military occupation of Mesopotamia but in trusting your own Indian fellow-subjects with arms and as the organisers of a National Militia.

As for the Arabs, who could have greater sympathy with them than the Mussulmans of the world. (Cheers.) Was not our Prophet an Arab? Is not Arabic the language of the Quran and of the Traditions? Is it not towards Mecca that we turn our faces when we pray five times a day, and is it not the Medina—the Medina that gave asylum to the Prophet and his Companions, and stood by his successor to the end—is it not there that so many of us long to secure, if only a grave? (Cheers.) No, ladies and gentlemen, you cannot expect us to believe that the Supreme Council and the Allies love the Arabs as much as we do. In fact, no Turk could claim from us the affection that is reserved for the people of the Prophet. But it is not a question of Arab or Turk. It is a question of Islam, (Cheers) and Islam is dearer to us than Arab or Turk, as it must be to Arab and Turk themselves. This question of Arab autonomy can well be left to Mussulmans themselves to settle, and foresee no great difficulty in the realisation of our dream of a federation that will give the Arab all the freedom he needs or demands.

Our third claim is that the Holy Places, namely, the three Sacred Harams of Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem, and the Holy Shrines in

Mesopotamia should remain in the custody and under the Wardenship of the Khalifa himself. The claim with regard to the exclusive Muslim control of the Island of Arabia is based on the dying injunction of the Prophet, and this claim with regard to the Wardenship of the Holy Places rests on a series of injunctions to be found in the Quran and the Prophet's Traditions. If our loyalty has always been based on full and free recognition of our religious obligations, and cannot rest on any other basis, then we have every right to insist that the Khilafat shall be preserved, that there shall be no Christian mandate over any part of the Island of Arabia, and that the Khalifa shall remain, as before the war, the Warden of the Holy Places. The Prime Minister claims that deference has been paid to Indian Muslim sentiments. But none has so far been paid to Muslim religious obligations, let alone Muslim sentiments. The only basis for the Prime Minister's claim seems to be that the Khalifa is to remain in Constantinople. But why is he to remain there? Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Bonar Law and Sir Edward Carson alike stated clearly that there was no other alternative, and if Tsarist Russia had not gone the way of all tyrannical autocracies, it would have been the Tsar who would have reigned at Tsargrad or Constantinple, and not the Sultan-Khalifa that would have been allowed to remain in Islambol out of deference to Muslim wishes. But that is not all. Even now, the Khalifa is to remain

there, because there he can be dealt with as a hostage always living in fear of Allied guns. So much for "deference to Muslim wishes." So far, indeed, is this from the truth that we can safely contend that Indian Mussulmans have not even had a fair hearing. You suppress their papers and intern and imprison their leaders and even revered divines, and when this "frightfulness" has gagged the rest, you claim that you have heard them carefully and patiently. (Cheers). Even now, we could not refer to the points raised by the Premier in his reply to us, for it would have lengthened the interview beyond the hour allotted to it, and would have cut into the night. But what is a night when questions that may mean years and decades of misery and trouble if they are not properly solved? What is a night after all, when to-day millions of people are passing sleepless nights waiting for one gleam of the rising sun of justice and equity after this horrible night of bloodshed and slaughter. (Cheers.)

But you will say what of the Armenian massacres? Ladies and gentlemen, I do not in the least overlook them. How can we who hold a brief for Islam—the religion of peace and persuasion, overlook the horrors reported? But this question has a whole history behind it. Why is it that we never heard of these massacres in Armenia before the last quarter of the last century? Shall I tell you? It was because Tsarist Russia was busy with massacre-mongering in other parts of Turkey in the Balkans.

It was only when the success of this great "camouflage" in the Balkans was achieved beyond the highest expectations of Tsarist Russia, that wanted a clear corridor from Petrograd to Peshawar, that Armenia was selected as the next stage on the journey. It is not sufficient to inquire into the fact of casualties. You must investigate when these "massacres" began, why they did not begin earlier, who was interested in their commencement, what intrigues went on inside and outside, whether peaceful subjects were slaughtered in cold blood or rebels dealt with as rebels are dealt with everywhere, whether an unarmed docile population was being exterminated by regular troops, or armed bodies of people were fighting among themselves on equal terms and a vendetta has been going on right to this day. Is it not true that the Armenians claimed representation in the Peace Conference because they were belligerents? Is it not even now being claimed for them that they assisted the Allies against their own Government and should be rewarded at its expense? Is it not true that these massacres are always heard of whenever any decision is about to be taken by the Allies with regard to territorial adjustment, and do they not occur just where capitalists see an excellent harbour and Imperialists find an excellent route by which a military railway could traverse a difficult region? I have no desire to prejudge the issue. But we have claimed, and we claim now, that for the first time an inquiry

should take place into the entire question, that an impartial international commission should undertake it, and that the All-India Khilafat Conference should be adequately represented on this Commission. Is that a demand for justice and truth or support of murderers? We challenge an open and impartial inquiry, for without such an inquiry you could not convince one Mussulman and one Indian that you were not of the same mind to-day as you were when your Prime Minister, in proposing a gratuity for Lord Allenby, characterised his campaign as the last and most triumphant of Crusades in which Great Britain won what the entire chivalry of Europe had failed to achieve in several centuries. It is not we who talk of Crusades but your Prime Minister.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, this is our claim, and we leave you to judge whether it is a claim for perpetuating a system of government by massacres or for justice and equity; whether we are disloyal people who threaten British rule or loyal people who have come only to warn the Government and the nation of the grave consequences of a bad peace—a peace that would be no peace, but would herald another and a longer, if not a bloodier, war, for it would be a war of conscience and of creed. We do not want to threaten, and we are of one mind with Col. Wedgwood, whose speech in the Constantinople debate we had the privilege to hear when we went straight to the House of Commons on our arrival in London. We do believe that more can be got

out of Englishmen by persuasion than by threats. But when he asks us what can we threaten with, I do not agree with him. It is clear that we cannot threaten you with powerful engines of war. But we can threaten you and do threaten you with the might of truth and with a weapon that no shield can resist, with an unconquerable will not to yield to injustice and iniquity ; with the will, in the last resort, to die. (Cheers.) I have addressed the British nation through this audience. To His Majesty the King-Emperor, too, I have a message to deliver through you. And it is in the form of a question. Can he any longer rely on the allegiance of his Indian and Muslim subjects if they betray the allegiance they owe to a higher King, the King of Kings? (Loud cheers.) And would he like to rule over a nation of slaves and cowards such as we would be if we submitted to the kind of peace that is about to be concluded, or to rule over men and women who honoured their conscience as their King and brought to his august Throne the unbought submission of a free nation? (Loud cheers.).

Mr. Syud Hossain : I want to put this problem of Turkey, which is really the problem of the Khilafat, not from the direction of Constantinople, but Calcutta. The fact is that the Sultan of Turkey (besides being the temporal head of the Turkish Empire) happens also to be the Khalifah of the Islamic world. This may be an unfortunate responsibility. It may be that the claims of the

Ottoman Sultans to the Khilafat may not be so satisfactory as some would like. I am prepared to concede all those academic difficulties. The more important thing is that seventy five millions in British India to-day recognise the Sultan of Turkey as their Khalifah. We are up against realities ; we have neither the time nor the inclination for academic discussions. If what I have stated is the case, how can we expect to continue loyal to the British Crown if we see England a party to the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire, which is also the Khilafat? (Cheers.).

Camouflage is a phrase that has come into universal popularity with the war, but its popularity has not ended with the war, and even now when we are supposed to be in the throes of the aftermath of the war, we find camouflage installed in the most exalted quarters—Downing Street and elsewhere. But we have got past the stage of political claptrap. We have not come here as the agents of a political agitation. This is not a political affair at all. It is a religious question which goes deep down into Muslim society and Muslim life throughout the world, and we as Muslims are not prepared to let the Khilafat go down unmourned, unhonoured and unsung. (Cheers.) As regards the consequences, it is true it is not very much we can do in the ordinary sense. It has been asked: "What can the Indian Mussulmans do—they are a disarmed population like the rest of their compatriots in India." It

is both very easy and cheap to put questions of that kind. Let me ask, supposing we can do nothing in the way of retaliation, even if we wanted to, is that the kind of foundation on which you propose to build up your great British Commonwealth—is it the whole sanction of my British allegiance that I can do nothing? (Loud cheers.) Have the statesmen of Europe, like the Bourbons of old, learned nothing and unlearned nothing from the Armageddon? Is that the last answer we can get from responsible Ministers and statesmen in this country?

Mr. Lloyd George is in Downing Street to-day, but he may not be there to-morrow. The British Empire, I am glad to say, is independent of Mr. Lloyd George's tenure of 10 Downing Street. The British Empire has to be continued by the people, and it is before the great British people that we lay our question of conscience. It is not a question of political bargaining. It is not a question of sentimental consideration for the Turk or the Indian. It is keeping alive the faith of Islam, which we are not prepared to let die. (Cheers.).

As you are aware we went to see Mr. Lloyd George the other day. The whole Muslim case was presented to him with "very great lucidity and moderation." Unhappily, neither the lucidity nor the moderation with which he credited us was reflected in his reply. We are concerned only to advance one ground and that is that Turkey cannot be torn into fragments like Germany and Austria,

because the day you tear the Empire of the Khilafat to fragments you outrage the feelings of seventy five millions of your own people. That is where the principle of self-determination comes in. (Cheers.) I do not know how this controversy may have to be fought out in its later stages. Certainly, so far as Mr. Lloyd George's reply is concerned it offers no way out. I want to remain a loyal subject of the British Crown, but I can only do so on this basis, that I shall have, as heretofore, complete religious freedom, that I shall be allowed to call my soul my own. (Cheers.).

MAULANA SYED SULAIMAN NADVI next briefly addressed the meeting in Hindustani, and said he represented a class that had never been indentified with secular agitations of any sort or kind and he had come to this country not to profit by seeing its architectural, its historic and national treasures but to add to the voice of his colleagues in a matter of religion which was one of life and death for Mussulmans of the world. (Cheers.).

MR. LELAND BUXTON: I have been given five minutes to speak, and all I wish to say is to add my protest against the policy of setting a Greek Empire in the near East. (Hear, hear.) I regard Greek Imperialism as the greatest danger to the peace in that part of the world. Its ambitions are as unbounded as its methods are barbarous and unscrupulous. I should like to point out the fallacy underlying the remark of the Prime Minister that the

Mussulmans in Thrace were a minority of the population. That was obviously untrue, because in the whole of Thrace they are in a very large majority. But assuming figures were correct, according to Greek statistics the Mussulmans and Bulgarians combined outnumber the Greeks. Therefore, to hand over Eastern Thrace to the Greeks would mean transferring the population to the rule of their worst enemies. I hope our Indian friends will point out to the Prime Minister the misleading nature of his remarks. You may be quite sure that if the Greeks get Eastern Thrace, M. Venezelos will bring forward arguments for securing Western Thrace, too. I am astonished sometimes at the moderation of the Greeks, for I have not yet heard that they have yet laid claim to the city of Manchester seeing the large number of Greeks who lived there. (Loud laughter.) I was glad to learn that a section of the Labour Party is associated with this meeting. It confirms my view that Labour takes a wider vision on foreign policy than either Liberalism or Conservatism.

MRS. SAROJINI NAIDU : I scarcely require five minutes to say what I am privileged to say in the name of the great community of Hindu men and women I represent to-night. We reiterate the pledge to stand to death by the Muslims of India. (Cheers.) If the great historic Empire of the Khilafat is to find a tomb in the chaos of the victories of the Allies then the Allies shall also have to find

a tomb for the compatriots of the Islamic faith. We Hindus are a people who have been pledged through all the centuries to maintain the Dharma—our natural and spiritual righteousness. When millions of our compatriots are threatened with the destiny which is worse than death, we cannot stand aside and let them die without companionship. (Cheers.)

Can the British people who boast that their Government is broad based upon the people's will, stand by and see this mockery of justice? (Cries of No.) Can you not see that you are false to your great traditions of liberty? Can you stand aside and let a great Empire perish, when out of that Empire you would build new territorial powers and principalities? You talk of self-determination and freedom, but we talk of self-determination, too. Shall there be one law for the Christian and another law for the non-Christian? If the Empire of the Khilafat is to be broken, let it be broken, so long as all other Empires are broken. On the ruins of broken Empires are established the democracies of the world. (Cheers).

MR. M. T. KADERBHOY: I feel highly inspired by the eloquence of Mrs. Naidu delivered here in defence of Islam, and I am sure that Muslim brethren feel happy and grateful at the magnificent oration of our dear Hindu sister to-night.

It is necessary for me to submit for the information of this meeting (as I am deputed to do so) that

“a mass meeting of the Mussulmans of Bombay was held under the auspices of the Anjumane-Zia-ul-Islam, where it was unanimously resolved that Muslim Khilafat Delegation, headed by Moulana Mohamed Ali, was not only the recipient of our entire approbation, but our sincerest prayers in the fulfilment of its sacred mission with regard to the question of Khilafat. It was also further resolved that special prayers be offered every Friday for the welfare and security of the members.” So you see from the above resolution that the Delegation was not only representative in its character, but was also composed of such worthy and noble sons of Islam as to cause anxiety in the minds of the Muslims with regard to the safety of its members. This is the slap from Bombay to the Printing House Square and the “Times” for its amazing impudence. (Cheers).

After the illuminating and stirring addresses given to you this evening by the distinguished and worthy son of Islam, Mr. Mohamed Ali, and his co-delegates, with regard to the question of Khilafat a question in which not only the Mussulmans of India, numbering more than seventy millions, but the whole world of Islam is so vitally interested that the natives of this country and Christian Europe can hardly realise its gravity and magnitude—it is not necessary for me to dilate upon it. Suffice it to say that I take my stand on the words of the Persian poet, who says: “Arrogance,

haughtiness and self-usurpation consigned the Arch-Devil to the eternal fury of Hell."

Every Mussulman lives and dies for his religion, and not like a Christian, that the religion lives for him, as the Archbishop of Canterbury, drawing £15,000 a year, living in a grand mission and in a grand manner, wants the religion to live for him. That was not the message left by Christ—(May the blessings of God be upon him)—but materialised Europe has exploited the religion in this fashion, whereas in the case of Mussulmans the aspect is spiritual and the spirit divine.

The whole world is passing through a crisis unparalleled in history, and we, Muslims, have been undergoing a terrible ordeal since the declaration of the war with Turkey and the threatened partition of the Turkish Empire against the wishes of the Muslims of India. If Britain partitions the Turkish Empire she will partition her own Empire. (Cheers).

MR. J. M. PARKIKH: I have the honour of representing the Executive of the Indian National Congress in this country. I am their Secretary, and I may say that the Congress, as a body, is in sympathy with the Delegation. Indeed, the whole of India is united on this question. Belief in religion is not a matter of argument, it is a question of faith. We must stand to a man and to a woman with our fellow-countrymen and see that their religion is saved. (Cheers).

MR. ARNOLD LUPTON: The wisest thing that

can be done is to leave the Ottoman Empire alone. (Hear, hear). The Ottomans are no worse than other men. I do not know that they are better. It would be impossible for them to be worse than we are. (Laughter). Do not misunderstand me. The English are the best and cleverest people in the world ; I also think some of them are the wickedest. The Ottomans have offered us their hand. They have asked us to help them. They are not too proud to take our assistance. We have fought each other, now let us try and work and trade together and advance the common good. Let us remember we are all the children of one great Father, and help each other. We must save the people of Constantinople from the starvation which threatens them, and we must save the Turks all over Asia from a similar fate. We must act now. In a short time it may be too late. We must try to make peace with the rulers of the Ottoman Empire, and go hand-in-hand with them in the march of progress. (Cheers).

DR. ABDUL MAJID : I have very much pleasure in moving a vote of thanks to the members of the Delegation.

MR. B. G. HORNIMAN : I beg to second, and only wish to say that no Delegation has ever come to this country from India with stronger credentials than Mr. Mohamed Ali and his colleagues, and I am convinced that if Mr. Lloyd George had as large a claim to represent the mind of England as the Delegation have to represent the mind of India, we

should have had a very different reply from that which he gave the Delegation on Friday last. (Hear, hear, and cheers).

The meeting, which was enthusiastic throughout, then closed.

THE INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION'S MESSAGE TO AMERICA.

(The following is an interview with the Indian Khilafat Deputation which has been cabled to America by the United Press of America.)

"If there is any question of setting up a 'Prisoner of the Bosphorus,' similar to the present Status of the Pope in Rome, or more particularly as at Avignon in time gone by, Mussulmans will have none of it."

Such is the emphatic declaration of Mr. Mahomed Ali, head of the All-India Khilafat Delegation, which is now here fighting against the expulsion of the Turk from Constantinople. The Delegation will shortly visit the United States to enlist American sympathy for the preservation of the integrity and independence of the Islamic faith, and in addition to the seventy million Muslims of India, Mr. Mahomed Ali claims to speak for 250 millions of his faith all over the world.

Mr. Mahomed Ali and his colleagues hold no brief for the old bad rule of the Turk in Europe or Asia Minor, and they rely upon President Wilson's

cardinal doctrine of self-determination and the love of freedom and tolerance ingrained in America since the departure of the "May flower" from the religiously oppressed shores of Britain.

Mr. Mahomed Ali pointed out, in an interview with the United Press, that the Allies employed Muslim soldiers freely for the suppression of Germany and her confederates, and that it would be a gross breach of faith, now that the victory is won, to behave as though Christianity had gained a victory over Islam. "If Christianity wants a new Crusade, she can have it, but not with the aid of Muslim soldiers," declared Mr. Mahomed Ali, in an outburst of fiery eloquence.

"Do not misunderstand me," he continued, dropping back into the normal reasoning calm of the Asiatic. "There is no hostile feeling in the Muslim world against their Christian neighbours, and it depends largely upon Europe and America whether racial bitterness develops. At present the campaign in favour of 'casting the Turk out of Europe' is very disturbing to Mussulmans. It is not the fault of India, which wants no crusades, but if anything of that kind develops in Europe and America it is only to be expected that a similar spirit will develop east of Suez.

"Seventy millions of Indian Mussulmans consider themselves outraged in their religious faith by this crusade against the Turks, and they are supported by 250 millions of Muslims, the Khilafat is centred

in Constantinople, and as far as India is concerned it is not merely a religious question, but a national one. Every other creed in India's 300 million population is prepared to support the demands of Indian Muslims.

Mr. Mahomed Ali, who was interned by the British Government for five years during the war, not for any crime but on account of his personal influence among the Muslims, declares that, on his release, he was astonished to find how enormously national sentiment had grown in India, even during the short five years of his internment, against which he makes no complaint. "The Indian people, regardless of religion or creed, are determined to support their Muslim brothers in their protest against what they regard as an infringement of religious liberty. About 300 million people cannot be ignored," he added, significantly.

"Muslims do not send us here to apologise for their faith," he continued "and if religious tolerance still exists, the Christian world, and the American people in particular, will realise that we are only asking for justice. The question of the future government of Turkey and Asia Minor can well be left to negotiation, but it must be impartial negotiation with due regard to the principles of self-determination, and not based on any hostile religious cry about 'driving the Turk out of Europe.'

"No Muslim soldier who assisted in the overthrow of Germany ever imagined that his services

would be utilised to overthrow the centre of his religious belief—the Khilafat. It would be an act of treachery for the Allies to abolish the Khilafat or dissolve Turkish rule in Constantinople—on the strength of their achievements. And as far as the campaign in Turkey, Syria, and Mesopotamia is concerned, Muslim soldiers played a very large part in its success.”

Referring to the question of Armenia, Mr. Mahomed Ali, declared that his Congress was ready to accept Mr. Wilson’s policy of self-determination there as elsewhere, but he did not favour the United States accepting a mandate for the government of the country. “For years,” he declared, “European foreign policy has always endeavoured to stir up strife in Armenia and elsewhere, and while we have the greatest confidence in America’s good-will we should not like to see her drawn into the maelstrom of European politics. Nor, apparently, is that the desire of Americans themselves,” he added. “In 1913 Turkey invited Great Britain to co-operate with her in the settlement of the Armenian problem, but owing to the ‘blue funk’ policy of Viscount (then Sir Edward) Grey, and fear of Russian objections, the proposal fell through and nothing was done.”

“Muslims are not trying to save Turkey from her sins or the penalties of being on the losing side in a war,” he concluded. “But they will not stand for the abolition of the Khilafat, and cannot sanction the establishment of a Mussulman Papal ‘Prisoner

of the Bosphorus' at Constantinople. They must have an independent Khalif, supported by an adequate army and navy and financial resources, to enable him to defend their faith in the case of necessity. In America—the home of religious freedom—we expect support in these claims." "India," March 13, 1920.

THE DELEGATION IN PARIS.

FRANCE'S MESSAGE TO INDIA.

The Indian Khilafat Delegation returned to London on the 21st March, 1920, after a crowded week in Paris. M. Millerand having had to leave for San Remo for the meeting of the Supreme Council, was unable to receive the Delegation in person, but directed M. Bargeton, head of the Asiatic Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to receive them on his behalf. Accordingly on the 14th the Delegation were received at the Quai d'Onsay by M. Peretly, Ministre Plenipotentiaire, Directeur-adjoint des affaires politiques et commerciales, Ministre des affaires etrangeres, and M. Bargeton, and accorded a most sympathetic hearing. Messrs Mohamed Ali and Syud Hossain put the case on behalf of India and Indian Muslims in regard to the Khilafat and the Turkish settlement fully and frankly and answered various questions put by the French Statesmen. M. Peretly, in the course of his reply, promised that the representa-

tions made by the delegation would be immediately communicated to M. Millerand at San Remo. Both he and M. Bargeton also assured the delegation of France's goodwill towards India and her sympathy for Indian sentiments.

On the 20th the Delegation addressed a well-attended and strikingly representative meeting convened at the Salle Hoche by the Comite de Defense des Interets francais en Turquie. M. Jules Roche, ex-Minister of Finance, presided, and was supported on the platform by M. Bluysen, Deputy for French India, M. Henry-Pate, Deputy for Paris, M. Melia, Chef de Cabinet of the Algerian Government, and several other distinguished French publicists. The audience also included M. Longuet, of "L'Humanite" and "Le Populaire," Colonel Lamouche, formerly Organiser Turkish Gendarmerie, Miss Grace Ellison, and a score of Turkish ladies, as well as representative Muslims from Tunis, China, Russia and Egypt. The Paris and provincial Press was well represented. The General Commanding Paris Army specially sent a Staff Officer to represent him, who, after the meeting, cordially thanked the Delegation for Indian soldiers' courageous assistance in the hour of France's sorest trial. The speeches of Messrs. Mohamed Ali and Syud Hossain were translated into French by M. Le Cocounier, Advocate, and of Maulana Sulaiman Nadvi, who spoke in Arabic, by a Muslim from Tunis. The meeting unanimous-

ly carried the following resolution put from the chair: "We convey to the Delegation for transmission to their brothers in India, testimony of our profound friendship and unalterable respect for their religious beliefs." M. Jules Roche, in introducing the members of the Delegation, said India had played a great part in civilising the world, which owed her a deep debt to be repaid by securing her liberty of conscience. Mr. Mohamed Ali, who on rising was received with cheers, said:—
Monsieur le President, Ladies, and Gentlemen,—

I have to apologise for not being such a polyglot person as I suppose I ought to be as a member of one of the subect races dominated over by Europe. I have learned the English language besides my own mother-tongue and a few other Indian and Oriental Languages, but I find that though I am among the Allies of England, my English will not carry me very far. Well, ladies and gentlemen we have been deputed by the 70 millions of Mussulmans of Indian and by the 250 millions of their compatriots of other faiths, who in this matter ardently sympathise with and support them.

On their behalf and on our own I thank you very heartily for the very kind and generous response you have made to our invitation at such very short notice.

France has been noted throughout the world for her widely extended sympathies and her human-

ity, and in any case it would not have been unnatural for us to expect from France a ready response to the call of righteousness and humanity. But our soldiers who came from India in the hour of your great need, and have now returned home after having shared with you the perils and privations of a devastating war, have carried with them the happiest recollection of your gratitude and of your goodwill, and it is but natural that we should expect from the good people of France consideration and respect for the most binding obligations of our faith and the most cherished sentiments of our nation. France, that has suffered so much in the war and is yet so beset with difficulties to-day in spite of victory, can well sympathise with those hundreds of millions who share our faith or our motherland and are a prey just now to terrible anxieties and corroding cares that deprive them of rest by day and sleep by night.

Ladies and gentlemen: We are here not to represent Turkey and the Turks, but to represent ourselves and our country, namely India. When the Turks come here they will have their own case to represent to you, but we who have come to-day in your midst do not present the Turkish case but the case of the Mussulmans of India and of all their compatriots who in this matter stand shoulder to shoulder with them. And our case is this: It is not that we have come here to save any territories. It is not that we came here to save any

financial resources. We have come here merely to ask you to spare us the one thing which to us is more than all territories, the one thing which is more than all financial resources, and that is the liberty of our conscience. (Cheers.) We have come to you, the people of France, to preserve us, and to help us in preserving the sanctity of our souls. (Cheers). This question which has brought us, as I said before, is not merely a Turkish question. It is an Islamic question, and Indian question, an Algerian question, an Tunisian question. It is the question of the preservation of the Khilafat. The Khilafat is the most essential institution of the Muslim community throughout the world. A vast majority of the Muslim of the world recognise the Sultan of Turkey to be the Commander of the Faithful, and the successor and Khalif of their Prophet. It is an essential part of this doctrine that the Khalifa the Commander of the Faithful, should have adequate territories, adequate military and naval resources, adequate financial resources. But for what purpose? Not for aggression, nor even for the defence of Turkey, but for the defence of our Faith. He is to stand before the world as the leader of the Mussulmans in this cause, and whenever the liberty of conscience of the Mussulman in any part of the world is placed in jeopardy, he should at least be able to say to the aggressor, "you shall not do that with impunity." (Cheers).

That is the main thesis of our claim. Apart

from that is our second claim, namely, that there are certain territories which are the local centres of our Faith just as the Khilafat is the personal centre of our Faith. They are known to us as Jazirat-ul-Arab, an expression which it may be somewhat difficult for you to understand. "Jazirah" in the Arabian language means an Island; the sacred region which is the local centre of our Faith is and has always been to us an island, though to European geographers Arabia is not an island but a peninsula. When our great Prophet, (on whom be peace and God's benediction), was departing from this world, he laid on the Mussulmans of the world an injunction, a great charge, that in this one spot on God's earth, in this sanctuary of our Faith, we should not permit any non-Muslim control. The boundaries of Arabia as a peninsula are known to you, but in order to understand how that same Arabia, which is a peninsula to you, becomes an island to us, you must understand that while it is bounded on three sides by the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf, on the fourth side it is bounded by the rivers Euphrates and Tigris. Therefore, in addition to the Peninsula of Arabia, it includes Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine. For more than 1,300 years these have remained in exclusively Muslim control, and we still want exclusive Muslim control there, not because in Mesopotamia we seek oil, as Mr. Lloyd George seeks oil in Mosul, but

because we seek there the birthplaces and the graves of the great Prophets of the world. (Loud cheers). For the most part these regions are not properly cultivated, and in places not even cultivable. Before Mr. Lloyd George found oil there they were not very rich in other resources also. But when we first found in our hearts an attachment for them, they were dear to us, not because they were the centre, God's kingdom already come, and a land of the Prophets, and we who consider ourselves not altogether alien to Christians and Jews, we who are the true heirs of Jesus Christ, Moses and Abraham, on all of whom be peace (for we recognise all the Prophets from Adam to Mahammad), we say that we cannot give up the wardenship of this one spot on God's earth without betraying the great trust that was imposed upon us as His servants and His alone by the Almighty God. (Cheers).

In this region of the Jazirat-ul-Arab are the three great sanctuaries of Islam—Mecca, Medina, and Jerusalem. Yes, Jerusalem, as dear to us as it could be to any Christian or Jew. They are all alike held sacred by us and we have always maintained Jerusalem as a sacred trust, not only for Muslims, but also for Jews and Christians, without any disparity and without any difference.

Apart from these three Sacred Harems, we have the Sacred Shrines in Mesopotamia of Najaf, Kerbela, Sammara, Kazimain and Baghdad, All

these, according to the Islamic commandments, must always remain in the custody and wardenship of the Khalifa.

This then is our threefold claim: That the Khilafat shall not be dismembered, but that the Khalifa shall have sufficient temporal power for the Defence of the Faith, that in the Island of Arabia there shall be exclusive Muslim control without mandate or protection, and that the Khalifa shall remain as heretofore the Warden of the Holy Places. And, ladies and gentlemen, you will have to acknowledge that we are very modest in our claims. We do not say that we want to be masters of the world, as a French journalist tried to make out when discussing our claims with us. We do not want as great power as France, Germany or England, but just power enough to defend our Faith and just one bit of territory specially entrusted to our care. The sum total of our claim is the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*. But we do not want to rule out political changes which would guarantee not only security of life and property to non-Turkish races, whether Muslim or Christian or Jew, but also opportunities of autonomous development.

We who come from India know how it is possible for a community that is in a minority to have its interests safeguarded, for we ourselves are just such a community.

Having achieved the purpose of the defence

and protection of our rights we have fought the battle of Indian freedom by the side of our compatriots, and to-day the Hindus, Muslims, and Parsees are standing shoulder to shoulder even in this matter, which is a purely religious matter—the question of the Khilafat and of the Holy Places. Therefore, we cannot by any means desire to rule out autonomous development for the Christians in Armenia, for the Jews in Palestine, for the Arabs there and in Syria and in Mesopotamia. The Arabs are of our Faith, are our brethren in Faith ; we do not by any means rule out opportunities for autonomous development for them, and we who are a subject race ourselves, do not want anyone else to suffer the humiliation of being a subject race without having a voice in the administration of her own affairs.

This is our claim: The War, this most unprecedented of wars—its horrors have been unprecedented, its weapons have been unprecedented, the extent of its slaughter of mankind has been unprecedented—this War is over and has long been over. After such a war it would have been natural to expect that people would be tired of war. And yet to-day, nearly a year and a half after the armistice, to-day nearly a year after peace has been concluded with Germany, which was believed to menace Europe and cannot menace anyone to-day—what do we find? Peace has not yet resumed her sway over mankind. Peace is not in the hearts of

men to-day. And if in the hour of your triumph, a triumph achieved with the assistance of Indian soldiers, of Mussulman soldiers, if to-day you say to those who were your partners in war, "You shall not be our partners in peace ; you made the war, you saved the war, but to-day you shall not make the peace, to-day we and we alone shall make the peace, and the kind of peace we like," then, ladies and gentlemen, it is my painful duty to tell you, and I tell you on behalf of over 300 million people, of whose feelings to-day you have no conception, that these people will unite to a man and unite to a woman and will not tolerate such a peace. (Loud cheers).

My friend, Mr. Syud Hossain, will explain to you what the situation in India is to-day. When you have heard him you will realise that you have not yet closed the chapter of war, and you cannot say, "Into this book we will look no more." On the contrary you will find that the world stands to-day on a precipice, on the brink of another and perhaps a greater war. In this hour of your triumph you must realise that Peace hath her victories no less renowned than war. You must realise that true religious conviction is a greater thing than material strength. You must realise that it is not sufficient to have large territories as spoils of war ; that it is necessary to convince mankind that you respect its religion, and that because you are great and strong you cannot force the con-

science of the small and the weak. If you save to us the liberty of our conscience, then and then only will you have peace. (Loud and prolonged cheering).

My friend will tell you that if the people who are meeting to-day at San Remo behind closed doors think that in this way three or four people can gather together and settle the destinies of mankind, they are very much mistaken. People are now determined that they will not tolerate a peace that is entirely against their conscience and entirely against their Faith, and that is at variance with the pledges given to them in the name of England, France and Russia ; pledges that this war would not involve questions of a religious character, that their Holy Places will remain immune from attack or molestation, that the religious obligations of the Muslims should be respected, that the Turkish portions of the Ottoman Empire will remain Turkish, and that for the rest security for life and property would be guaranteed and opportunities of autonomous development would be afforded. If these pledges are not carried out, and if unfortunately anything happens in India, as I am bound to say it is likely to do, it will be very difficult for France or Italy to avoid trouble altogether. Trouble may begin in India, but it will not end in India.

Ladies and gentlemen, you do not know and we cannot forecast to-day what repercussions it will have in the East. But you who have large

commitments in the East, I think it is necessary in your own interests that you should take heed to-day while there is yet time, and we come to you in the friendliest of spirits to give you a friendly warning. Is it not necessary and proper that one friend should come to another in such grave contingencies as are in view and give a friendly warning of the danger ahead? We hope that in your own interests you will do what you can to influence your Government, and to save another war, for which not even Europe is prepared to-day.

But more than this ; as friends of England we hope that you will use your privilege as a friend to warn England also and advise her and tell her that she is facing a real and not a fancied danger.

This is all that I would say now, and I am afraid that I have bored you a good deal already by speaking in an unfamiliar language. Once more I thank you.

It was a Frenchman, I believe, who wrote that man was born free and everywhere he is in chains. And if mankind is to-day in chains, it will be, I hope, a Frenchman who will break those chains.

There was a time when the French went out to the East in the hope of conquering India. But it was destined for another Power to conquer India, if Indian can be said to have been really conquered. But to-day you have an opportunity of conquering not the land but the hearts of India, and

I say to you, "Vive la France !"

MR. SYUD HOSSAIN was next called upon to speak.

He said: Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen,

I should also like to begin by apologising to you very sincerely for having to inflict my few remarks on you, in a language which is, I am afraid, as foreign to me as to you, but these are the exigencies of our present day International complications. and I hope you will bear with me for that reason.

My friend and colleague, Mr. Mohamed Ali, has already explained to you the solemn and absolutely inalienable religious obligations of the vast community of Mussulmans not only in India but in the world at large with regard to the Caliphate.

There are just one or two things which I would like to present to you as clearly and as briefly as I can.

The first thing, ladies and gentlemen, that we would put before you is this: That it is not merely the Mussalmans of India but the Muslims of the world who are interested in maintaining the Institution of the Caliphate. If Islam is to exist in the world, then it is absolutely essential that Islam should have a Caliphate. That has been the history and tradition of Islam ever since its foundation fourteen hundred years ago, and so far as the Muslim world is concerned, you may take it from me, ladies and gentlemen, that the Muslims are not prepared to let the Caliphate perish from this world.

In regard to our actual credentials I will say

this to you: I will ask you for one moment to visualise a population united with the same culture, the same antecedents, the same historic traditions and the same religious obligations—a community of 75 millions of people solidly and solemnly united on this question. That is the constituency that we directly represent and which has elected us to come out to you on this mission. You compare this figure with your own population, with the population of Great Britain, or with that of any other European nation, and you will then perhaps realise the numerical strength of the people we represent, whose religious convictions we have come to put before you.

But, ladies and gentlemen, it is not merely the 75 millions of the population of India who own allegiance to the Muslim Faith, who are concerned in this matter. The population of India is 315 millions, and the vast non-Muslim element of the population is absolutely identified with its Muslim compatriots on this question. (Cheers.) Now you can very well ask what interest the non-Muslims of India have in a question that is admittedly a religious question affecting the Muslims and no others. My answer to that is that during the last few years, especially during the period of the War, the Indian national movement of which some of you may have heard, has been gaining strength and gathering volume with a rapidity of which you can have no conception. Even five years ago it might have been

said with some truth that there was not one India but several Indias. But to-day, ladies and gentlemen, you may take it from me that there is one solid, united, nationalist India, a nationalist community which wants freedom for a united India. And our Hindu, Parsee, Sikh, Christian, Jewish, and other fellow compatriots of India are identified with us in this Muslim movement of the Caliphate, because they have come to realise, and it is a very enlightened and truly democratic and progressive conviction, that the principle of Indian national unity demands that the most solemn religious obligations and sentiments of 75 millions of the Indian people shall not be allowed to be trampled underfoot. It is for this reason that the Hindus are to-day standing shoulder to shoulder with us. It is an authentic and inspiring conception of true Indian nationalism that has brought the whole of India together on the issue of the Caliphate. (Cheers.)

So much, ladies and gentlemen, for the genesis of this Indian movement, and it is for the reason I have mentioned that we claim, as we informed the British Prime Minister in a recent interview which our deputation had with him, that this question of the Caliphate is not only a Muslim question. It has acquired the status of an Indian national question, because the solid United Indian nation is standing behind this movement, and ladies and gentlemen, what do we ask for? As those of you who are at all in touch with affairs in the East know, we are not

famous for our enterprise in any direction ; we are not Imperialists ; we are not concession-hunters ; we are not exploiters ; we do not seek to go into other people's territories and exploit them for our own benefit ! We do not even wish to say for other people how they shall self-determine. (Laughter.) All we ask is to be let alone in respect of our spiritual and cultural existence. You know there are not many fragments of the world's surface now left outside Europe which are not to-day under one form or another of European domination. But we do say this that the Holy Land of Islam which contains all the Holy Places and Shrines of Islam, hallowed by the memories of fourteen hundred years of Islamic history shall not pass from Muslim hands. We draw the line at that. We say you have exploited the universe, but you will not violate these Sanctuaries : leave these Shrines and these Holy Places alone, because they are vital to us in a sense of which you can have no conception, dearer than anything else in life, and indispensable to our religious and communal existence.

It is not a political claim ; it is not a territorial claim, it is not a claim of aggressive nationalism. It is a claim for liberty of conscience, for the rights of Faith which are inalienable. I hope you will agree with me that there is nothing irrational or unnecessarily aggressive or excessive in that.

That is our case—that the Caliphate shall not pass from the world, that the Holy Land of Islam

shall continue to remain inviolate as during the last fourteen hundred years. It is a case which obviously and frankly we have put before you from the religious point of view in the name of the liberty of human conscience. But look at it from our own point of view. Supposing that you (and by you I mean the Allied Powers) supposing that you have got the means, power and strength to impose upon us an unrighteous peace. Supposing you can do so, in fact! Well, is that likely to bring into the world that peace and harmony, and that universal contentment which I believe all the civilised peoples of the world to-day are longing for? Is that the way to build up an enduring peace hereafter? Are you going to achieve tranquility by trampling under foot the most solemn religious convictions and cultural requirements of seventy five millions of people, and the national sentiment of one fifth of the world's population? In fact, as you know, it is even a larger issue in all its ramifications, but we confine ourselves to speak for our own constituency, which is the people of India. (Cheers.) What kind of peace are you going to have? It will not be peace so far as you are concerned, or so far as our people are concerned, those millions who own allegiance to the Islamic faith, and who shall be bound in conscience not to accept, but to resist, to reject it as far it lies in our power. Where then does world-peace come in? Surely it is not right, looking at it from any conceivable point of view, rational or moral, and

taking a long view of things, that the world should be precipitated into so momentous and gratuitous a cataclysm. (Cheers.).

Those of you who have any voice or influence in the shaping of the peace, it is your duty to understand the point of view of those whose rights of liberty of conscience are assailed and threatened at the present moment, and so far as that goes, it stands to reason you can judge for yourselves whether it is not preposterous that men, I do not care how great men they may be two or three, or half a dozen men, should have it in their power to sit down behind closed doors and dispose, not only of the territorial but also the spiritual destinies of a vast portion of the population of the world.

It is a complicated question ; it is a question which you will only understand if you bring to its consideration a large measure of sympathy, insight and tolerance for other people's views and sentiments. Those views and sentiments may not be yours, but you must recognise as a fact that they represent the convictions of a large section of the world community, and as such are entitled to be treated with respect and consideration.

Those who are statesmen and those who have taken upon themselves to settle the destinies of the world and the foundation of a lasting peace, it is surely their duty to see that the sentiments of so many millions of human beings, of those who have been your friends and allies, shall not be violated.

Tens of thousands of my fellow-countrymen, of my co-religionists, came and shed their lives on the battle-fields of France, Flanders, Mesopotamia, Egypt and Palestine, in defence of the cause of Freedom, as they believed the Allied cause to be. Are you going to tell us to-day, now that the war is over—those among you who are politician and statesmen, you who know the solemn pledges that were given to our people by the British Government in the name of the Governments of France and the other Allies, are you going to tell us that you are going to be false to those pledges and promises, and, if so, do you think you are going to have peace in the world? This is a question, ladies and gentlemen, which does not require any answer. (Cheers.)

We have come to you on a mission of peace. We have no aggressive designs against anybody. We come to you with a message of reconciliation, and to help you to understand our point of view and build up a lasting understanding between all the Allies and Islam, between England and France and Islam because France has got large Muslim obligations, and if France allows herself to be a party to the kind of iniquity that we fear is contemplated, then it is idle to expect that she will not be involved in all the repercussions that must follow upon a grave outrage on the religious sentiments of the Islamic world.

Therefore, I have only this to say in conclusion, that, whatever else you may believe in or not, you

may take it that if the Caliphate is dismembered, and the sanctity of the Holy Places of Islam violated, the world will be plunged in a grave and incalculable ferment. So far as we are concerned, we have already intimated to our Government that, if they are to be a party to the negation of the cardinal obligations of the Islamic faith, then Muslims will have no option but to consider themselves absolved from the loyalty and allegiance they owe to the British Crown.

What is the situation in India to-day? Do you know that on March 19 last—a matter of a few weeks ago we had in India a complete cessation of all business what you might have in Europe, supposing it were possible to have a universal strike from one end of the Continent to the other; not merely a railway strike or a postal or tramway strike, but a universal cessation of all business and all forms of activity. That is what we had on March 19 in India, and its sole object was to impress upon our Government, as upon the world, that India is united and is deadly earnest in respect of this demand on behalf of the preservation of the Caliphate. Just think what it meant! As you know, India is as big a country as Europe, minus Russia, and from one end to the other of India not only Mussulmans, but the whole population, stopped work for one day as a peaceful demonstration on behalf of the Caliphate. Our people to-day are a very poor people, and it involved them in a loss of millions,

but they cheerfully bore that sacrifice, as they are willing to bear many other sacrifices, in order to proclaim that, whatever else they may have lost, they do not propose to let the last symbol of Islamic power and existence pass away from the world unchallenged and unmourned. That we are prepared to prevent as far as it lies in our power. We have constitutionally and loyally put our irreducible minimum before the British Government, and we have come here to do the same in France.

You know very well that throughout the East the name of France is synonymous with respect for liberty of conscience, not only yours and mine, but universal conscience. I mention that as a fact, not as a compliment.

Take it from me, ladies and gentlemen, that if France is going to be a party to the violation of our conscience, France will be equally a party to a general demoralisation of the world-conscience, and France should not go back upon her great traditions. (Cheers.).

M. JULES ROCHE, (President of the meeting):

"Ladies and Gentlemen, I have really but very few words to say after the very luminous statements that you have heard, but only to tell you that if I had needed to be persuaded, the speeches would have been sufficient to convert me. I am convinced that it will be the same with all those who have heard the speeches which have been delivered by the different people who have spoken to you, and

you will have noticed the testimony of confidence and esteem which is manifested with such frankness by the representatives of a race and a country which count in the history of the world. Human civilisation has had many cradles. It is difficult to say exactly which has played the greatest role, but it is certain that India is in the first rank."

The speaker then described, in eloquent language, the great part which the civilisations of India and Egypt had played in the cultural development of the human race. There were 227,440,000 Mussulmans in the world, he continued. They would see, therefore, that the Mussulmans were of some importance. They had heard from the representatives of India of their number and of their importance from that point of view of culture. But they would agree that there was the fullest justice in their demand for liberty of conscience. There was nothing more legitimate.

Although the last cannon shots had been heard for ever, they could not say that they yet entered upon a normal state of peace. If they desired to reach that state at the earliest possible moment, it was necessary not to commit mistakes analogous to those that had been committed in the past. He trusted that the representatives of India would achieve by their visit to France the objects which they so justly demanded. (Applause.).

M. HENRY-PATE, Deputy for Paris: Ladies and Gentlemen, When I had the honour to receive the

Indian Khilafat Delegation, which invited me to assist of to-night's meeting, I thought I should come here like others to hear the excellent orators who have preceded me, and I was very much honoured to find my name in the list of speakers. I asked myself what title I had to figure among them except that I could, as Reporter-General of the War Budget, recall the assistance given by the coloured soldiers included in the ranks of the French Army, professing the same religion as the Delegation. The coloured troops who throughout the war have, by the side of our own, accomplished the heroic deeds of which you know and who in all circumstances have given their blood for the country, remind us that France is a mother who loves the son. She has adopted as much as those she has borne in her womb. They fought for us and we have respected their religious convictions.

The French Republic would have committed the greatest mistake if they had attempted to penetrate that conscience. As M. Jules Roche said just now, conscience belongs to the individual and nobody can assail it.

I wish to recall also that the Indian troops came to fight on the soil of France. I remember many days when I toured the whole line of battle and met your Indian soldiers who fought with a courage, a spirit, and an ardour truly admirable, and who to-day have mixed their blood with ours and sleep in

the same French soil which has been preserved to us, thanks to the soldiers of liberty.

We have not the right to forget that these men threw themselves into the struggle for us. We have not the right to forget that we owe to them all that we are to-day. Whilst your brothers came here to take up arms in the struggle to fight, to give the death-blow needed to save the country of liberties, you come to-day in your turn, as pacifists, as men who wish to defend your religion and your conscience. You have rendered us a great service. The duty of immortal France is to repay you to-day in recognition of the deeds you have achieved and by helping you to achieve the cherished ideas to which you are dedicated not to fight, but to die as you said to me in my office the other day. It is the appeal of one people to another.

You said that France was the land of liberty, of generosity, where one could appeal to all those sentiments which honour you also. Your people have addressed to the heart of France, to that heart, ladies and gentlemen, which has bled and suffered so much for five years, but it is always young, always new when it is called upon to an appeal for generosity, justice, and truth.

It is at your service. We give it to you.

MAULANA SYED SULAIMAN NADVI: My two colleagues, who preceded me, have addressed you in a language which was not the language of your country. They spoke to you in English, the

language of a far-off Island in the West of Europe. I propose to address you in the language of your fellow-citizens of the Republic of France inhabiting the northern shores of Africa (Arabic), and thus I shall be speaking, in a language of France itself.

The objects entrusted to our Delegation and for the attainment of which we have crossed 7,000 miles of land and sea are no doubt the demands of the Mussulmans of India, but if the members of this Delegation lay claim to represent the whole of the Muslim world in this matter none can question or deny them that right. Our demands are neither political nor commercial. They are religious, and religious alone, and therefore they deserve the sympathy of all those persons who profess some religion or believe in any ethical truth.

The Mussulmans have lost many portions of the earth before now, but they never raised any cry of appeal nor did they send any delegation to Europe to plead their cause. Those losses were merely the incidents of the current political life of the day. Turkey herself has been involved in more than one war in the past. She has suffered defeats also. But in those wars there was no danger of the disruption and annihilation of the Khilafat, and consequently the Mussulmans living outside Turkey did not interfere at all. Affairs, however, now seem to have reached a pass when the basic stone, on which are laid the foundations of their faith, is in danger of

being uprooted by the avalanche of European imperialistic greed, military chauvinism, and capitalistic exploitation.

The question of the Khilafat is one of the fundamental doctrines of Islam. The Prophet has directed the Mussulmans in the most unambiguous language never to let the smallest period go by without choosing an Imam, or in other words a Khalifa. He has also said that if a Mussulman died without having acknowledged an Imam, he would die the death of ignorance, of a Kafir—an infidel. The final decision, on many ecclesiastical and theological points in Islam, depends on the very existence of a Khalifa. Throughout the Islamic world the sermons at Friday prayers end with the name of the Khalifa. The Khalifa is the successor of the Holy Prophet of Islam, the Leader of the world-embracing brotherhood of the Faith, and the recognised and acknowledged Head of the Republic of Islam. Right from the glorious days of the Prophet to our own, this institution has continued unbroken among the true believers.

Medinah was the earliest seat of the Khilafat, and from here the first three Khalifas issued their decrees. The second seat of the Khilafat was Kufah, which is situated in Mesopotamia. After this the Omayyids ruled the Empire of the Khilafat from Damascus, for the period of a full century. The Abbassids performed the functions of the Khilafat for over five hundred years from Bagdad.

On the sack and destruction of that romantic city of the hands of the Tartars, in 1258, Egypt became the centre of the Khilafat. When Sultan Selim wrested that country from the hands of the Memlukes, in 1517, the last of the Abbasside Khalifas went over to Constantinople and resigned his exalted office in favour of the Turkish Sultan and appointed him his successor. At the same time he handed over to the Turkish Khalifa the holy relics of the Prophet, which are still in the custody of the present Khalifa at Constantinople. Since then the sovereigns of the Ottoman State have been unquestionably recognised as the Khalifas of Islam and their names have been invoked every Friday in the mosques of Europe, Asia, and Africa. All the Great Powers have acknowledged them as such without any opposition, and this status of the Sultans of Turkey has been specially mentioned in more than one international document and treaty. More than this. Whenever a political need has arisen the Government of Great Britain has always obtained from the Turkish Khalifas orders and firmans addressed to the Mussulmans of India. During the wars in Southern India, when Tippu Sultan was fighting on the side of the French against the English, a firman of this kind was obtained, in which the Turkish Sovereign, as Head of the Islamic Brotherhood and Church, called upon the Indian Sultan to break off his relations with the French and enter into an alliance with the English. Again on the occasion of the Sepoy

Mutiny in India in 1857, the Turkish Khalifa was requested to issue another firman calling upon the Mussalmans of India to remain loyal to the English, who were the friends of the Sultan Khalifa. The late Ameer Abdur Rahman Khan of Afghanistan has mentioned it in his biography that this firman created a very favourable effect on the tribes on the North-West Frontier of India. Even to-day, where on the one hand the Khalifa has been made the Prisoner of the Bosphorus, and Islam insulted in a manner unprecedented in its long history of a thousand and three hundred years, fatwas are being forced from Constantinople on the other, and distributed broadcast in Egypt, Mesopotamia, and India, and thus attempts are being made to deceive, in the most open manner, the Mussulmans in these countries about the real state of affairs.

We are told that the question of the Khilafat is one for Muslim opinion alone to decide and no interference of any kind whatsoever is intended in this matter by anybody. But the doings of the Allies, on the shores of the Bosphorus, present a spectacle than which no better proof could be found of the farce of our own free will and the reality of the interference by others. The first condition, in fact the very foundation of the Islamic institution of the Khilafat—as taught by our sacred books—is that the Khalifa must be independent ; he should have adequate power to defend the Faith ; he should have sufficient military and economic resources at his

disposal, and the area under his dominion should be sufficient to satisfy the needs and requirements of an independent State.

The history of Islam bears ample testimony to the contention I have put before you just now. The Khalifas of the House of Omaiya, the House of Abbas, and the House of Osman satisfied all these conditions. At the time of the death of our Holy Prophet the most powerful tribe among the Arabs was that of the Koreish ; and after due deliberation and consultation among the Companions, the Khilafat was entrusted to members of this tribe, from whom it was transferred to the Houses of Omaiya and Abbas when they qualified themselves for discharging the duty of the maintenance and defence of Islam to the satisfaction of the Mussulmans. And now, for several centuries, the Ottoman Sovereigns have been the Khalifas of the Mussulmans, because they along are considered to satisfy the conditions necessary for the proper continuance and defence of this institution.

To further dismember of the Ottoman Empire and to distribute its fragments among the Allies, after the low dimensions it had reached at the termination of the Balkan War, is in reality, to break asunder the holy institution of the Khilafat. No true Muslim is prepared to allow or to tolerate this. Further, it is diametrically opposed to the fundamental conception of freedom of faith, on which the

loyalty of every Muslim towards his wordly rulers is based.

The problem of the Jazirat-ul Arab comes next. Just as the Khalifa forms the personal centre of the vast brotherhood of Islam, the holy land which we call Jazirat-ul-Arab is our territorial centre in a geographical sense. The island of Arabia is surrounded by the Euphrates, the Tigris, the Sea of Syria, the Red Sea, the Indian Ocean, and the Persian Gulf ; and in it are included the regions known by the names of Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, and Arabia. This is the portion of the earth in which flourished many Prophets, Mesopotamia was the home of Adam and Abraham and a few other Prophets ; all the great Prophets from Abraham to Jesus lived and taught in Syria and Palestine ; Hobab, Salih, and the last of the Prophets, Mahomed, had their homes in Arabia. The Ka'ba, situated in the holy city of Mecca, is the qibla (the point towards which the Faithful turn their faces when praying) of Islam, and it is the place where all the Prophets came for pilgrimage. The last of the Prophets was born here. Medinah, the asylum of the Prophet of Islam after his migration, holds in its bosom the mortal remains of the greatest of men. Bait-ul-Maqaddis—Jerusalem the third haram of the Mussulmans was their first qibla also for quite a long time. In Mesopotamia are buried Khalifas, Companions of the Prophet, and the Warriors of the Faith. Every inch of this land is replete with memories

and traditions of Islam and is consequently dear to us and is our acknowledged Holy Land. For thirteen centuries we have defended its sanctity with Muslim blood and lives. It is overwhelmingly and predominantly Muslim in population and race and has a very negligible percentage of non-Muslim people. We the Mussulmans, who believe in all the Prophets with an equal faith and devotion, regard ourselves as the inheritors and guardians of this Holy Land.

The two problems I have placed before you are not and cannot be the playthings of politicians and party leaders, as some European statesmen—worshippers of the fetish of nationalism—and especially the Ministers of England seem to believe. These are the deep-rooted religious beliefs of the Mussulmans, and they will never be able to eradicate them by any show of slight, indifference, force, or power.

To us Mussulmans the secular and the religious have only one meaning. To fulfil our mundane duties honestly and truthfully is our religion. None can claim to be our Khalifa until and unless he is recognised as such by the entire Muslim world. He must also possess all the available and existing means at his disposal to defend and continue the Faith. Thus the religious part of the Khilafat cannot exist without the secular. In the same manner it is a part of our religion and a duty enjoined upon us to defend the Jazirat-ul-Arab from passing into the control of non-Mussulmans. No Mussulman can have any doubt whatsoever in his mind on these two

questions. We are convinced that in whatever part of the globe they live they are absolutely at one with us in this matter and support us entirely in our efforts. In this very meeting we find Mussulmans from such distant countries as North Africa, Russia, China, and India. They can very well say if we are representing their views or not. Because the number of Mussulmans is the largest in India, their responsibility in this matter is proportionately heavier ; and also because among the Powers, whose policies are clashing against the dictates of Islam, the foremost is that with which are connected the Mussulmans of India and from whom they received the most solemn and clear pledges in regard to the sanctity of the Holy Places and the preservation of the Khilafat. The Power has nearly eighty million Mussulmans under its dominance. The second on the list is France, with fifteen million Mussulmans as her subjects. The Mussulmans of Tunis had, not so very long ago, drawn the attention of France towards this question. The Government of France sent them messages of assurance and appeasement through the assistance of thousands of their loyal Muslim subjects. Not to pay due regard and consideration to the religious demands and obligations of these Muslims, in the hour of triumph, is not only a moral and religious crime, but is likely to let loose the forces of trouble and disturbance into an already fatigued world. The Mussulmans of India have most clearly warned their English rulers that their

loyalty to them is primarily based on respect for their faith. If the religious obligations of the Mussulmans are not paid the fullest regard to, then they will be compelled, as a means of self-preservation and self-defence, to boycott English goods, break off all relations with the enemies of Islam and help the Khilafat in any and every possible manner. But before we are forced to do that, we propose to make our last appeal to the sense of justice and fair play of the Allies. Our demands are purely religious and non-political, and deserve the attention and respect of all Christians, Jews, Mussulmans, every one who has any religion or faith.

M. PAUL BLUYSEN, DEPUTY for French India : I owe to my mandate as Deputy for French India the honour of offering to the Muslim Delegation from British India, our great neighbour, a friendly salutation and the tribute of my warm sympathy and that of all my compatriots.

I perform this double duty with sincere satisfaction and I am persuaded, on seeing the numerous and attentive audience here, that these cordial sentiments are shared by them all. These sentiments go to make French opinion acquainted with the very noble object of its efforts. France has always welcomed the manifestation of generous ideals and has often offered a fraternal hospitality to the political exiles of all countries. In the present circumstances she must show herself especially cordial towards personalities so eminent as those of the Muslim Delegation.

tion, whose mandate comes with genuine enthusiasm from the popular masses of India for a world-wide cause, extending from the confines of the Pamirs to the shores of the Bosphorus and even into the dark deserts of our Protectorates and dominions in Africa.

It is a cause which has for its foundation the religious convictions intimately bound on the one side to the Khilafat at Constantinople and on the other to the material and moral life of the people who espouse it ; and there is not in the history of the world a more moving example of brotherhood than that which is brought to us to-day by men fighting pacifically, by word and by pen, to convince humanity of the necessity of seeing that their faith is respected.

The only fault of our dear France is perhaps ignorance of the beautiful countries where the unanimous veneration of the Quran sways the minds of the people ; she has only far and few relations with the people of India who constitute a population of more than 300 million inhabitants. The duty of those who, like myself, have the good fortune to know these countries as well as our African territories, is to tell our fellow-citizens of the metropolis how much, on the other side of the gates of the Suez Canal, the intellectual life of the masses has undergone a notable development while remaining attached to the religion of the Prophet, who, in the simplicity and the grandeur of his conceptions, was

a model of high moral tenets and preservation of the family ideal.

France ought to know that the Indian and African peoples in bowing before European political supremacy and in adopting from our progress what is compatible with the spirit of their religion, have more and more evolved a proper care for their own personal status and for the achievement of human solidarity.

In all the countries inhabited by the Indians, minds beautify and the hearts beat in unison. The ancestral benevolence that I have seen so often prevailing in Hindu and Muslim homes towards pilgrims and the poor, who have no other abode than the temple or the houses of the rich, that benevolence has always appeared to me as one of the most beautiful characteristics of the populations among whom I have lived and among whom I count so many friends. It would now extend itself from the bodies to the souls and carry its fruits to all brothers of religion who feel themselves menaced or who feel that the free exercise of their Qur'anic faith is assailed.

France thus enlightened in regard to these things by the persistent and courageous action of the Muslim Delegation, will understand that there is here for her a superior right to testify her fidelity to her high traditions of liberalism. France has never ceased to be liberal towards her Muslim, Brahmanic, Buddhist proteges and subjects ; she is responsive to

appeals made to her heart and to her respect for the beliefs, that I have so many times heard expressed in the meetings in India.

I am convinced that when she sees how this question is agitating the followers of the Khalifa, France, that is to say, her Government, her Parliament and her People, will listen with sympathy and will know how to listen to the voice of men, educated and proud of their status in the civilised world, who demand that Europe shall not trample upon their cherished convictions and violate their consciences.

M. JEAN MELLA, formerly Chief de Cabinet of the Governor-General of Algeria: I am not here to speak in the name of our Mussulman fellow-subjects in Africa who, having confidence in the liberalism of the French Republic and the traditional policy of our country in the East, have not thought it necessary to send to Paris a Delegation to plead for the maintenance of the Sultan at Constantinople. But as a born citizen of Algeria, who has preserved all his attachment to the land of his birth, I am able to express, at this meeting, the sentiments which animate the majority of us in Africa in favour of Turkey.

From the day when France placed her foot upon the Algerian soil, a new destiny began for her. It was France who opened the gate of her metropolis to regions torn by constant internal struggle, having the Muslim religion alone as an influence of amity and concord.

France, who has not made wars of conquest for the sole benefit of commercial men, but who has made them for progress and civilisations has solemnly sworn from the first day, the 5th July, 1830, in the treaty which made her mistress of the city of Algiers, that she would ever respect the lives, the property, and the religion of her new subjects.

Thus, she was transferred into a great Muslim power who accorded, to the vanquished of yesterday and her children of to-day, the right to a full and free moral and material existence and extended to the four corners of the Dark Continent that liberty of conscience which the declaration of the Rights of Man proclaimed with the Revolution of 1789.

France, the land of tolerance and justice, solicitous for the conquest of souls, after having conquered the most distant tribes, should never forget how great is the Islamic faith in Muslim countries and she is bound, in consequence, as much by her love for her adopted children as by expediency, strongly to affirm, as she has always done, the independence of the Holy Places where Mohamed was born and died, and also the absolute respect that she has for the spiritual power of the Khilafat.

When Turkey, at the instigation of Germany, entered the war against the Allies the situation became very delicate. Germany reckoned that she could count on the success of her project, since there were still in Algreia descendants of the expedition of Baba-Arroudj, and a large number of Koulougis,

that is to say descendants of the unions of Turks with Moorish women, still retaining their relations with the country of their ancestors.

But the indigenous Mussulmans of all Africa who find the full development of their conscience and personality under French rule immediately saw through the intrigues of Enver Pasha and his accomplices. They recalled that our country had always been the friend of the Ottoman Empire and they did not forget that Francis I, Henry IV, Louis XIV, and Napoleon III, had always supported it against the ambition of its neighbours.

Foreseeing the bloody conflict that was to rage between France and Turkey, a most friendly Mussulman of Northern Africa, Municipal Councillor of Constantine, Doctor Morsly, wrote on the 16th October, 1914: "Turkey has again fallen into the claws of Germany . . . she ranks with the enemies of France. Poor Turkey! Unhappy Ottomans! What misfortune pursues you! What demon pushed you to your ruin!" And interpreting the feelings of his co-religionists he declared: We Algerian Mussulmans, whenever we were fighting against people who were indifferent to us, have helped you with our sympathy, our goodwill and even with our money. We could not, in fact, forget, in spite of the memories your Government has left behind in this country, that you were Mussulmans like ourselves. But to-day, notwithstanding the sincere attempts of France to save you from death

(?), you put yourselves against her, you march with the Germans. Ah! That! No! Do not count upon us any more. We do not recognise you. Neither are we Young Turks nor Old Turkians, nor Turkish Mussulmans. We are and we shall always remain French Mussulmans."

France wished to remain faithful to her traditions and to those Africans who, having to choose between her and Turkey, accepted her, but who remembering that they were Mussulmans wished for the momentary defeat of the Ottoman Empire and not its final dismemberment.

And France took care, through the medium of her Governor-General in Algeria, to publish, on the 4th November, 1914, an address to the indigenous Mussulmans in which it was stated that:—

"France does not nourish any anger towards Turkey, brave loyal and worthy of sympathy. She will take vengeance only on those who join with the Germans, or those who making themselves slaves or accomplices, violate the rights of France and draw Turkey away from her destiny and her traditional policy."

Thus, whilst the indigenous Mussulmans, through the medium of one of their co-religionists, ranged themselves on the side of France, France, through her Governor-General in Algeria, affirmed her friendly feelings for the Turkish people.

The Government of the French Republic gave expression to these sentiments, in a circular dated

the 15th March, 1915, through the then Minister of War, M. Millerand, to the General Commanding those regions, in the following words:—

“At the moment when France, England and Russia have decided to intervene in Turkey, it appears necessary to give the military interpreters charged to assist African soldiers and to safeguard their loyalty, some instructions which would enable them to reply, in accordance with the views of the Government, to the questions which may be put to them by these soldiers, regarding the object of that intervention and the motives that have led the Ministers (Young Turks) to sacrifice to their ambition the true interests of Islam and enslave their country to the German Government. The Ottoman Empire was thus delivered up to the criminal aspirations of the German and by this fact became the enemy of France. But if France was at war with the Government of the Young Turks she could not forget the friendship which, since the sixteenth century, joined her to the Ottoman people, and it is with the greatest sorrow that she learnt that Turkey had no longer her liberty. . . . In these circumstances the Allied Powers could not remain disinterested spectators of this deplorable situation. They decided to send their fleets to the East to force the passage of the Dardanelles and to deliver Constantinople from the anarchy which reigns there and from the yoke of the German soldiery. All true believers, desirous of seeing the integrity of Islam and the

independence of the Khalifa respected, support the Allied Forces in their thoughts and count on them to preserve the safety of the Islamic World."

It is a matter of honour for M. Millerand, who has now become President of the Council, to remain faithful to the principles which he announced in his circular and to affirm to the Peace Conference the obligation of maintaining the seat of the Sultan at Constantinople. In acting thus France helps in preserving the greatness of Islam.

Without doubt the world of Islam is plunged in torpor. Europe, who had in former days so often seen the triumphant armies of the sons of Muhammad over-running her trembling soil, believed that this sleep was death. She disposed of the Universe according to her own taste for a full century. But she has found to her great astonishment that Islam is day by day showing signs of re-awakening. There is no doubt we are as yet witnessing the first tremor of the eyelids ; the eyes of Islam habituated so long to the shadow are half opening as though dazzled with too great a light ; and Europe wants to profit by it still by exercising her influence over her and even by her entire dismemberment.

But France raises her voice in favour of Turkey and thus our country alone can present itself before Islam with all the moral guarantees, all the nobility of its heart and all the testimony of its past friendship. Islam may have confidence in her, for France seeks not territories nor the exploitation of them.

Commercialism is not her ambition, for France also carries, in the folds of her flag, all the ideals of liberty, of emancipation, which have aided her in her trials so well that she would no longer be France if she were not above all dominated by the spirit of fraternity.

Let us also remember that the Mussulman inhabitants of Africa are our friends and our brothers. They also constitute a force which has contributed and will always contribute to the defence of the French fatherland. Did not the Muslim women of Africa pray, in the rustling softness of the white mosques and the holy shrines, to Allah for the triumph of France a Christian Nation? And shall we forget all the Muslim soldiers who have died for the victory of the Allies?

Let me tell the Indian Delegation, who have come here to Europe to plead the Ottoman cause, that we French of the Metropolis or the Colonies, whatever may be our passing allusions, will not cease to urge to hope that the Khilafat, maintained at Constantinople, will once more become the friend of France; we will not cease—in spite of all—to remain the friends of all Islam, because, according to our minds and our hearts, we think that France is and ought to be more and more in Islam the predestined nation, because our country has neither egoism nor commercial greed, nor monopolistic instincts and because, thanks to her tutelary genius and the loyalty of her conduct, our country alone

permits to all the Mussulmans of the world an ever-increasing opportunity of regaining, by progress and advancement, the glorious and resuscitated epoch of their ancestors.

M. LE COCONIER : Our President has charged me to submit the following resolution :—

“We address to the Muslim Delegation of India, the Khilafat Delegation for transmission to their brothers in India, the testimony of our profound friendship and our unalterable respect for their religious beliefs.”

Will those in favour of the adoption of this resolution kindly raise their hands?

The resolution was carried unanimously.

MR. MOHAMED ALI, at the conclusion of the meeting, said : Ladies and gentlemen, I thank you all again most heartily for responding to our invitation and for giving us so patient a hearing and your great sympathy and support. It was a Frenchman who wrote, “Man was born free and everywhere we see him in chains.” If that is still true, then I hope it will be Frenchmen who will help mankind to break its chains. There was a time when the French set out to conquer India but another European Power was destined to rule over her. But France has an opportunity to conquer not the territory of India, but her heart, and if France would set out to conquer the heart of India, I would say “Vive la France.”

INTERVIEW WITH MR. MOHAMED ALI & MR. SYUD HOSAIN IN PARIS.

MR. MOHAMED ALI.

All the political problems of the moment have an international character, it is the great characteristic of the time which our comrade, Paul Louis, has so well emphasised in his latest book.

This reflection came to my mind again yesterday when receiving, in the office of the "Populaire," the delegation of Mussulmans from India, having at its head the illustrious Mohamed Ali, their recognised leader. On seeing him I also recalled to my mind his previous visit to Europe in 1913. He, on his part, recalled with emotion the memory of our world, whose irrisparable loss is mourned by all—with whom we had at that time, all the three of us, a most animated exchange of ideas in the office of "L'Humanite."

Mr. Mohamed Ali is accompanied by two distinguished representatives of the Mussulmans of India, Syud Hosain former editor of the "Independent" of Allahabad, and Syed Sulaiman Nadvi, Rector of the Shibli Academy. These are all three Mussulmans of very modern tendencies, of great intellectual culture, and speak English with remarkable purity.

Mr. Mohamed Ali told me of his experiences in India during the last few years, of the conditions in which he was after the declaration of war, arrested and incarcerated in virtue of a century-old law,

without any trial by a regular letter de cachet, issued by the Executive because he had "expressed sympathy with the Khilafat." However, unanimous protests of Indian Mussulmans compelled the Viceroy ultimately to release him. And immediately afterwards he resumed his activity.

"And in what conditions," I asked him, "are you actually in Europe?"

"We have come as the authorised representatives of the All-India Khilafat Conference, at whose last gathering at Amritsar not less than 20,000 delegates assembled from all over India. Also, let us say, not only in the name of 70 million Mussulmans, but in the name of our 200 million Hindu and Buddhist compatriots, who are in full accord with us. We had in our last conference all the most eminent persons of the Indian National Congress. Thank God! All India is to-day completely united."

"What is exactly your mission?"

"We have come to demand that the integrity of the Ottoman Empire should be respected, that Constantinople should remain its capital, and that, above all, the Holy Places of our Muslim religion be left to it. It is our absolute wish that none of these regions shall become the prey of European Imperialism, with its spirit of rapine and violence.

"This wish was expressed on March 19 last by a formidable general strike which took place all over India. The movement embraced tens of millions

of adherents. In all the cities all the factories and shops were closed."

"Certainly, that your strength has already impressed itself upon the British Government is shown by the fact that that master of opportunism, Lloyd George, once more considerably modified his attitude and by the declarations of Mr. Montagu, the Indian Minister who knows what force you represent and what the British Empire owes you in the past! And that in twenty four hours! However, you have a great task to achieve. Capitalism of the great predatory nations has long teeth. . . ."

"And be assured that we are far from being satisfied," said Mohamed Ali, "with what is being done in the East. The occupation of Constantinople by the British is an indignity which has caused the anger of Mussulmans in every country. The Khalifa is the prisoner of the Bosphorus—that is an insult to the whole of Islam. You have seen in Tunis what was the effect of this. That will be general. And then there were the arrests and deportations of Ottoman Ministers. That shocks us. Do you know that they have arrested and deported the Shaikh-ul-Islam because he refused to issue a *fatwa* or bull of excommunication against Bolshevism—a *fatwa* that they wanted to use against Soviet Russia? This grand honest man and a courageous Musilm patriot refused to prostitute his pen and his mind and preferred to submit to deportation.

"The English have replaced him by a pseudo-

Shaikh-ul-Islam, who will sign no doubt a fraudulent *fotwa* against Bolshevism which will not have any value."

"You have already entered your protest against this in London."

"Oh, yes. Certainly. On March 2 before Mr. Fisher, acting for the Secretary of State for India, and on March 19 before Mr. Lloyd George himself.

"We are determined besides not to stop there, but to appeal directly to British opinion, outrageously worked up by a campaign of cynical imperialists who want to dismember Turkey for the profit of their capitalistic interests. They cover themselves with a religious cloak of Christianity in order to deceive the English people. It is pure hypocrisy.

"We mean to get into direct touch with the labouring classes. We have had three successful conferences with the Executive Committee of the Labour Party, who gave us the most cordial welcome. For the 22nd of this month we are organising a big meeting at the Kingway Hall over which Mr. George Lansbury will preside."

"And now what are you doing in Paris?"

"I am going to San Remo to bring the representatives of the Entente Powers face to face with their responsibilities. My comrades, Syud Hossain and Syed Sulaiman Nadvi, will remain here.

"England has 100 million Muslim subjects. France has about 35 million. I hope that her Government will realise its obligations. I must recognise

that its attitude on the question of Constantinople has given no more satisfaction than that of our own British Ministers. And then in France, as elsewhere, we count above all on the active sympathy of the people, the labouring masses."

And, grave under their turbans and fezes, their eyes shining with the ardent conviction which was translated into all their words and all their gestures, the representatives of the millions of Mussulmans of Hindustan retired after shaking us warmly by the hand. "Populaire," Paris, April 16, 1920.

MR. SYUD HOSAIN.

The Delegation from India for the defence of the Khilafat is now in Paris. Its mission is to make known to the Governments and public opinion of the Allied and Associated Powers the sentiments and views of 70 million of Mussulmans of India, as well as the non-Muslim population of India, in regard to the future of the Khilafat and the proposed settlement with Turkey. One of the members of the Delegation, Mr. Syud Hossain, former editor of the "Independent," has made to us the following interesting declarations :

"It is important that France, which is a great Muslim Power, should understand the significance of the question on which we have come to inform European opinion. The Delegation has been sent by the All-India Khilafat Conference, which is unquestionably the most representative national

organisation that has ever been constituted in India to deal with a political question. It includes not only all the recognised elements of the vast Mussulman population of India, irrespective of party or sect, but also the foremost leaders of the Hindu community as well, such as the famous Mahatma Gandhi, and the Honourable Pandit Motilal Nehru, the President of the Indian National Congress.

"Now this question of the Khilafat is no doubt essentially a Mussulman question, and it may therefore be asked why the Hindu community of India, numbering something like 250 millions, should have made common cause with the Mussulmans in this matter. The answer to that question is to be found in the fact that in recent years the national movement in India has solidified with incredible rapidity, and the present entente represents a concrete manifestation of enlightened Hindu-Muslim unity.

"The rapprochement between the two great communities of India is not tainted by any sort of opportunism. On the contrary it is inspired by a reasoned patriotism which has come to realise that national welfare and the future salvation of India depend upon a real unity of outlook and identity of sentiment between the Hindus and Muslims. The Hindu leaders, under the guidance of Mahatma Gandhi, have frankly recognised that the religious obligations and sentiments of their Muslim compatriots regarding the maintenance of the Caliphate

are deserving of all respect and consideration, and basing themselves on this conviction they hold that on a question which involves a matter of life and death to the millions of Muslim in India, they must stand shoulder to shoulder with their fellow-Muslim nationalists. It is in this way that the All-India Caliphate Conference came into existence, and the deputation of that body which waited upon the Viceroy of India in January last included the foremost recognised leaders of both communities.

“The Indian Muslims are interested in the future of the Ottoman Empire chiefly because the Sultan of Turkey happens to be the Caliph of Islam. For the last 400 years the Caliphate has been vested in the House of Othman, and the Sultans of Turkey have accordingly commanded the unquestioned and spontaneous spiritual allegiance of the Muslim world by virtue of their position as “Commander of the Faithful.” Now the Caliph of Islam has to be something more than the Pope of the Roman Catholics. It is of the very essence of the Institution of the Caliphate that the Caliph should be an independent temporal sovereign before he can be the spiritual head of the Muslims. This is an indispensable condition according to the law of Islam, because thus alone can the Caliph fulfil his role as Defender of the Faith. It follows, therefore, that the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire must involve the collapse of the Caliphate, and it is this possibility which has stirred the Muslim world to its depths.

I do not know how far it would be possible for me to give my French readers any idea of the intensity of Muslim feeling and Muslim misgivings respecting that eventuality ; I may, however, mention one or two facts which I think are sufficiently significant. In the first place, never before in the history of India has there been such a universal ferment as that which is now going on regarding this question. That is an admitted fact which I think the British Government itself would be willing to acknowledge.

“Now, this ferment will have the gravest consequences if the Peace treaty with Turkey does not take sufficiently into account and respect the solemn obligations of their faith. We have been obliged to give the British Government a solemn warning as to this. Apart from the general fundamental question of keeping the temporal fabric of the Caliphate intact, to which I have referred, there is the further cognate but specific issue of the preservation of the Holy Shrines and Sanctuaries of Islam in Arabia, Palestine, and Mesopotamia. All these Holy Places are included in the area defined by Muslim religious authorities, and delimited by Arab geographers, as the “Jazirat-ul-Arab” of the Island of Arabia, bounded on the north by the Euphrates and the Tigris. This area is the Holy Land of Islam, and its custody according to the binding injunctions of Islamic law can never be surrendered to any form of non-Muslim control.

“During the 1,400 years of Islamic history, the

Island of Arabia has ever remained in Muslim hands, and the Muslim world will never acquiesce in any departure from that religious necessity and historic tradition. Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem, Kerbela, Najaf, Sammara, Kaziman, and Baghdad, represent the nerve-centres of Islam, and it is simply unthinkable to the Mussulmans that the Holy Places around which cluster the most cherished and imperishable traditions of their faith should ever pass out of their own wardenship.

“It will thus be seen that from this point of view any question of mandate for Arabia or Mesopotamia or Pelestine will not be acceptable to the Muslim world. It should be understood that so far as the Muslims are concerned, this is not a matter of sentiment or theory, but of indefeasible religious obligation, which no Muslim may surrender or sacrifice. But I should like to make it clear that Indian Muslims are not impelled by any narrow or sectarian motives. They believe that if only an honest and bona fide attempt is made to apply the principle of self-determination to the Peace settlement with Turkey, and if further a real effort is made to secure the conditions of a just and enduring peace in the Near and Middle East, the result would largely coincide with their own demands and the fulfilment of their religious requirements. They are convinced that the reintegration of the Ottoman Empire on lines of order and progress will be a powerful factor for a world-peace, just as its disintegration cannot fail to

involve the world in immeasurable discord and conflict.

“The Muslim world is the less ready to see the Caliphate perish because it is perfectly clear that the forces working for its desruption are in the main nothing better than the same old factors of imperialistic and financial exploration that have already destroyed the freedom and the culture of so large a portion of the non-European world. India, as well as the Muslim world, is not willing that the last of the Islamic States, constituting the sole symbol of the temporal tradition of Islam shall pass from the world, as one more victim of the insatiable lust of European aggrandisement. Nor is their fear an unfounded one. Already there are clear and sufficient indications that Imperialistic greed and commercial exploitation of the more sordid kind are the motive power behind the clamour for the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire. The scramble, indeed, for the “sick man’s inheritance,” to recall an old phrase of European diplomacy in reference to Turkey, is proceeding in hot haste.

“The Muslim world and India were amazed to hear no less responsible a personage than the British Prime Minister say the other day that the British intended to “claim” the mandate for Mesopotamia, because, forsooth, Mesopotamia contains “some of the richest natural resources of any country in the world,” and Mosul has rich oil deposits! This confession in all conscience is far removed from the

principle of self-determination and of those lofty and sublime objects for which Great Britain was declared by her statesmen at the outbreak of the war and during its continuance to have unsheathed the sword.

But apart from the issue as between Great Britain and India, the question of Turkish settlement is one that equally affects France and Italy, who are both great Muslim Powers, as well as the civilised world as a whole, because the future peace of the world is unquestionably bound up with a just and equitable settlement of peace with Turkey. We want a peace that will make for harmony and concord, not only in the ever-troubled region of the Near East and the Middle East, but also draw together the Muslim populations of North Africa, Egypt, India and Central Asia into fraternal relations of mutual trust and friendship with the European world."—"L'Information," Parise, April 22.

THE DELEGATION'S VISIT TO PARIS : IMPRESSIONS.

BY MR. MOHAMED ALI.

When Indians visit England, they still have the feeling that they come to a place where, and to people by whom they will not be regarded as aliens. And yet in the busy throng of London, how little is anything heeded that affects hundreds of millions of

people in India most vitally. Meetings are organised, interviews are arranged, newspapers are approached, and although some success is achieved in these ways, no Indian can help feeling that he is almost in alien in the very centre of the Empire, which, in the hour of its need, he is always called upon to regard as his own.

On the other hand, when we went to Paris, we almost feared that we should be derelicts on that vast sea of social pre-occupations if no longer after a devastating war and its aftermath of terrible economic difficulties, the whirlpool of gaiety. But France seems still to be true to her ancient traditions, and Paris is even to-day, if not the home of lost causes, at least an asylum for every nationality that has a grievance and that expects, and not in vain, to find there a sympathetic understanding.

The Paris Islamic Information Bureau, financed by India, had arranged with marvellous rapidity for a number of interviews with men and women prominent in the public life of Paris, and early in the week that we spent there some two dozen distinguished Parisians, including a few Frenchwomen, responded to the invitations sent over-night to hear an exposition of the Muslim and Indian point of view.

My colleague, Mr. Syud Hosein and I stated what claims the Mussalmans, of India and their fellow-countrymen of other creeds had put forward, and explained the mandate of the Delegation and the

rational Khilafat and the temporal power that it must retain, defining at the same time the boundaries of the "Island of Arabia" and indicating the binding nature and *raison d'être* of the dying injunction of the Prophet that this land of Prophets should ever remain in the exclusive wardenship of Mussalmans, the servants of God and the heirs of all His Prophets.

Our speeches were interpreted sentence by sentence by two Frenchmen who cordially sympathised with the aims of the Delegation, and although this form of speaking is bound to be somewhat boring, we were agreeably surprised to note how quickly French intuition grasped the essentials of our exposition.

M. Melia, formerly Chief Secretary of the Algerian Government, and prominently connected with an organisation of French Mussalmans in Algeria and Tunis expounded how France stood with regard to her Muslim population. At the end of this Conference, we were warmly congratulated by those present, and it was not until 1 or 2 in the morning that the last of our guests departed.

An appointment had been privately arranged for us with a prominent French official directly connected with M. Millerand, who discussed the whole position with us in an interview lasting for over an hour. During this interview he took copious notes for submitting to the French Premier soon after, together with the publications of the Delegation. It was after this that a most courteous letter

was received from M. Bargeton, Director of the Asiatic Department at Quai d'Orsai, regretting the Premier's inability to receive us personally and informing us that he was placed himself, by the orders of M. Millerand, at the disposal of the Delegation to hear all that we had to say, and to communicate it formally to the French Government.

When, however, we arrived at Quai d'Orsai on the following day, we learnt in the course of our interview with M. Bargeton that, since the matter was of extreme importance, M. Peretty, Joint-Director of Political and Commercial Affairs of the Foreign Ministry, was anxious to hear the Delegation himself, and we consequently walked over with M. Bargeton to his Bureau. There, for nearly two hours, the entire situation was discussed in full detail, and we could not help remarking the wide imaginative sympathies of the French people, and their quick intuition. Islam's outlook on life, which it used to take an hour to explain to the most sympathetic of Englishmen, was readily grasped in a few minutes, and in a country which in spite of its large Catholic population is perhaps preponderantly anti-clerical, it did not take us long to justify, from our point of view, the retention of temporal power by the Commander of the Faithful. Here, certainly, was no talk of "vaticanising" the Khalifa. M. Millerand had already left for San Remo, but we were informed that all had said would be immediately communicated to him.

We were invited very cordially by M. Bluysen, the Deputy for French India, and although Pondicherry and Chandernagore are such microscopic fractions of India, we soon found that this French politician who represented them in the Chamber of Deputies in Paris was fully alive to the gravity of the situation in India at the present moment. It was not want of understanding or sympathy that was the trouble here, but the unfortunate position in which France finds herself at the end of this war, in spite of her phenomenal sacrifices. However, we soon came to the question of ways and means and as a representative of a part of India, however small, M. Bluysen enthusiastically promised us every assistance in Parliamentary and Government circles, and we hope, on our return to discuss matters in full detail with the Parliamentary Committee for Foreign Affairs and other such bodies through the kind offices of M. Bluysen.

The day before our meeting at Salle Hoche, we called on that great French writer, M. Claude Farrere, and although here, too, was the same French courtesy and imaginative sympathy, we found besides these something that one does not ordinarily meet with in this materialistic world. There were no apologies and no excuses for the delicate position in which France found herself, and no insistence on so-called "practical politics." Here was deep and earnest emotion which revived our drooping spirits, and a firm determination to

support the Mussalmans of India in their defence of the freedom of human conscience.

M. Claude Farrere, at least, understands that this is not a struggle only between Imperialistic exploitation and the Muslim faith, but between Mammon and God. He acknowledged to us that the battle we were fighting was not the battle of Islam alone, but of all religion ; and that if the Khilafat was dismembered, it meant the negation of all Faith. He told us that French interests coincided with the Turkish ; but he assured us that even if they had not coincided, but were the polar opposites, he would still have supported Turkey and the Khilafat, because their cause was the cause of Righteousness and Truth. His fiery eloquence and deep emotion brought tears to our eyes, and we left him with the much needed assurance that even to-day the European world contained some highly religious men and that faith still counted with them far more than finance.

On the very day that our meeting took place, we caught a glimpse even in France of the centuries old prejudices that Imperialistic exploitation knew how to utilise for its own nefarious purposes. We had an animated discussion with a notable French journalist, who was evidently a disciple of Gladstone with his "bag and baggage" policy. But we hope this gentleman knows something more to-day than he did before of the array of argument and reasoning behind the Muslim and Indian claim. At any

rate, he was sufficiently impressed to desire another discussion, and in spite of a somewhat heated controversy, we parted in the friendliest of spirits.

And what shall I say of the meeting at the beautiful Salle Hoche, magnificently illuminated with a large number of chandeliers and reflecting the entire audience on each side through the mirrors that ran the entire length of the side walls. In London, in spite of advertising our meetings in the Press, we have not yet ceased to be nervous about filling them ; but here there was neither advertisement in the papers, nor posters to announce our meeting, merely invitation cards having been sent out to a number of people distinguished in French public life. On the eve of the meeting, I was wondering whether we would get even a hundred people to respond to our hurried invitation at only a couple of day's notice. But our fears were soon dispelled when a whole hour before the time fixed for the meeting, a stream of distinguished visitors passed through the ante-chamber where we received our guests, and by 9 o'clock the hall was absolutely filled.

The speeches will tell their own tale, no doubt, but they cannot convey the cordial sympathy and lively enthusiasm of the audience. The speeches of the Deputy for French India and M. Henry-Pate, Deputy for Paris, were greatly applauded, and they will deserved that reception. But what was such an agreeable surprise, our own speeches in

English were listened to with rapt attention, even though they could not have been understood by more than a few dozen of the audience who knew English or Arabic, in which the Maulana spoke with regard to Islamic obligations.

Both in the meeting and in the interviews that we gave to visitors we realised that Paris was, at any rate, the political centre for Eastern people, for we met here, not merely French Muslims from Algiers and Tunis, but Chinese and Russian Mussalmans, and quite a score of Turkish ladies eager to hear what their Indian brothers had to say, and half apologetic for appearing before them without their veils.

I think I have said everything of what we found in Paris. But these impressions will be hopelessly incomplete if I do not refer to the one thing that we failed to find. In England, whenever we discussed the Turkish Settlement, the so-called "Armenian Massacres" always turned up at the end of every argument with the insistence of King Charles's head in a certain famous memorial. But never once throughout the long and frank discussions that we had with all kinds of men and women, politicians, authors, and journalists, not once were the "Armenian Massacres" mentioned in Paris. And yet the world knows well enough that it is not a French characteristic to be indifferent to murders and massacres in any part of the world. Evidently

the reality behind this camouflage was well understood in France.

We left on the following morning following the Salle Hoche meeting for our meeting at Kingsway Hall, and our second conference with the Advisory Committee of the Labour Party. We promised to return on the 5th May, and we hope to address a much larger and still more representative meeting in Paris, which M. Longuet, the ever popular Editor of the "Populaire", has so kindly consented to organise on our behalf. His paper, although only a two-paged sheet, has somehow always succeeded in finding room for the Muslim cause, and we hope the kind assistance of M. Longuet and his party will enable us to explain to those on the Continent who are tired of worshipping at the altar of a narrow nationalism, the supernational character of Islam and the communism underlying its insistence on individual responsibility. For Islamic Brotherhood is a Republic and the most determined advocate of Liberty, Equality and Fraternity, and although it inculcates the utmost respect for property, it demands from every Muslim the recognition in practice as well as in theory that he is a trustee on behalf of Allah of all that he possesses for the benefit of all His creatures.

KHILAFAT DELEGATION REFUSED HEARING.

OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE.

The following correspondence between Mr. Mahomed Ali as head of the Khilafat Delegation and Mr. Lloyd George will be read with interest :—

THE INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION,
Royal Court Hotel,
Solane Square, S.W.1.

March 26, 1920.

SIR,—I am desired by the Indian Khilafat Delegation to request you to be good enough to arrange that the Delegation may be received by the Supreme Council now engaged in drawing up a scheme for the settlement with Turkey, before its work is over, so that the Delegation may explain the Muslim point of view with regard to the settlement, stating the obligations imposed on Mussulmans by their faith, and giving expression to the overwhelming sentiment of Indian Mussulmans and the ardent sympathies of their compatriots of other faiths, who are at one with them in this matter.

I too invite your attention to the following passage in the Address presented by the Deputation of the All-India Khilafat Conference to the Viceroy and Governor-General of India at Delhi, on

January 18, last, when they waited upon His Excellency :—

“And since we have been repeatedly asked to remember that in arranging such a settlement Great Britain, whatever her position among her Allies and Associates, could not leave their interests and wishes out of consideration, we trust that our Deputation (that is to say, the Indian Khilafat Delegation), will be able to explain to the Allied and Associated Nations and their Governments the nature and binding force of Islamic obligations, and the true character and scope of Muslim aspirations.”

I am to say that cables received from India in large numbers with regard to the total suspension of business, by all communities throughout India, on the 19th instant, involving a loss of millions of pounds, and the meetings of protest held all over the country, indicate that the situation, far from improving since the Delegation sailed from India, has undergone a change distinctly for the worse and the Delegation trust that they will be able to impress the Supreme Council not only with the reasonableness of the Indian claims, but also with the grave and extremely unfortunate consequences to the peace of the world of a settlement that does not respect the religious obligations of Mussulmans on which their loyalty to their secular rulers has always been based. In the words of the Address to which I have referred above, their desire to lay before the

Supreme Council a full and clear statement of the position in India and the East generally "would have been both natural and laudable at any time ; but in view of the grave situation that exists to-day and is fast developing into an unmistakable menace, it has acquired an urgency and an insistence that have compelled us to give respectful expression to it" through the head of His Majesty's Government.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
(Sd.) H. M. HAYAT,
Secretary.

The Rt. Hon.
The Prime Minister.

2, Whitehall Gardens,
London, S.W. 1.
April 7, 1920.

Sir,—I am directed by Mr. Lloyd George to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of March 26, containing a request that the Indian Khilafat Delegation may be given an opportunity of expressing its views before the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference, and in reply beg to state that, at the request of the British Government, the Supreme Council has already heard the official Delegation of India. As it has been made a rule of the Peace Conference not to hear anyone except the accredited Governments of territories with whose future they

are dealing, the Supreme Council regrets that it is unable to accede to your wishes.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sd.) M. P. A. HANKEY,

British Secretary, Supreme Council.

The Secretary,

The Indian Khilafat Delegation.

The Indian Khilafat Delegation.,

8, Albert Hall Mansions,

Kensington Gore, S. W.

April 9, 1920.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of a letter addressed to me by the British Secretary, Supreme Council, dated the 7th inst. in reply to the request which I had the honour to address to you, that the Indian Khilafat Delegation may be given an opportunity of expressing their views before the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference.

I am directed by the Delegation to say that they note that the Peace Conference has made a rule "not to hear any one except the accredited Governments of territories with whose future they are dealing," and that "the Supreme Council has already heard the official Delegation of India." They, however, desire me to state that the cases of the Mussulmans of the world, and of the accredited national

delegation of India stand on so different a footing from those covered by the rule that the Delegation hope the Supreme Council would reconsider its decision.

I am to say that the Turkish Settlement, involving as it does the question of the Khilafat, in the preservation of which the Mussulmans of the world are so vitally interested, does not obviously seem to be a question on which the Peace Conference should hear only the Governments of territories with whose future they are dealing. In fact, the concern of the Muslim world for the future of the Khilafat, which is the most essential institution of Islam transcends in importance the interests of the various Governments that are being set up in different part of the Khilafat territories.

A concern that is so vital, and affects so large a portion of humanity, inhabiting several continents, and that arises from a feeling deeper than patriotism, and yet not territorial in its essence, cannot, in view of the Delegation, be ignored by the Peace Conference in arranging a settlement of the world's affairs to which it attaches any degree of finality, and by means of which it hopes to restore once more the sway of Peace over mankind.

With reference to the official Delegation of India, which the Supreme Council has already heard, the Indian Khilafat Delegation would invite the attention of the Council to the fact, that so far at least, the State and the Nation are not one in India,

and the Delegation submit that a nation numbering more than 315 millions of people is entitled to a hearing before a final decision is taken on question that has incontestably acquired a national status.

The Delegation hope that they may, without any disrespect to the members comprising the official delegation of India also refer to the fact that no Indian Mussulman was represented on the Delegation in spite of Muslim protests.

Since the Indian Khilafat Delegation are here to urge a full and fair consideration of the religious obligations of the Mussulmans who acknowledge His Majesty the Sultan of Turkey as the Successor of the Prophet, and Commander of the Faithful, and have been deputed by the Indian nation to represent its views before the Peace Conference, the Delegation hope that the Supreme Council will enable them to explain these obligations and views. If an opportunity such as they desire is not given them, it is likely to create a sense of injustice in the vast populations that are vitally interested in the success of the mission of peace and reconciliation with which the Delegation has been charged. This will defeat the purpose of the Peace Conference itself, which must obviously be to reconcile its decisions to the conscience of mankind.

I am to invite your attention once more to the gravity of the situation in India and the East generally, and the Delegation would beg you, both in the interests of justice and of tranquillity in the Indian

Empire, to give to their request your most earnest consideration. They hope that they may say without offence, that apparently the gravity of the situation is not so fully appreciated on this side as, on account of their more intimate knowledge of India, they themselves appreciate.

They, however, hope that you will pardon this apparent importunity because it arises out of nothing beyond their anxiety to reconcile their loyalty to His Majesty the Emperor of India, and their fervent desire for the restoration of peace in Asia.

If, as the Delegation fear, the Supreme Council is not likely to arrive at a decision with regard to the request at a very early date, I am to say that they would greatly value another opportunity of placing their views before you,

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

(Sd.) H. M. HAYAT,

Secretary.

THE RT. HON.

THE PRIME MINISTER.

Paris, 22nd April, 1920.

Gentlemen,—His Majesty's Ambassador directs me to inform you that he has been requested by the Secretary of the British Delegation to the Peace Conference at San Remo to convey the following to you :—

“The Supreme Council have considered your letter of April 9th and are unable to re-

consider the decision conveyed in the British Secretary's letter of April 7th."

I am, Gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,
(Sd.) THOMAS SPRING RICE,
Secretary.

TELEGRAM TO SUPREME COUNCIL.

The following telegram was addressed by Mr. Mohamed Ali, Mr. Syud Hossain and Maulana Syed Sulaiman Nadvi, members of the Indian Khilafat Delegation, on the 20th April, 1920, from Hotel Regina, Paris, to the President of the Supreme Council of the Allies at San Remo, and also to the British, French, and Italian Premiers and the Japanese Ambassador assembled there :—

"The Indian Khilafat Delegation representing seventy millions of Mussulmans in India and two hundred and fifty millions of their compatriots of other faiths who ardently sympathise with and support them, consider it their duty, not only to their co-religionists and fellow-countrymen, but also to all desirous of establishing permanent peace in the world, to urge upon the Supreme Council, at this critical juncture, not to disregard the religious obligations imposed by their faith on the Mussulmans of

the entire world, and the overwhelming national sentiment of India, with regard to the Khilafat and the Turkish Settlement. The mandate which our Delegation have been charged to lay before the Governments and peoples of the Allied and Associated Powers has already been submitted and explained in detail to the British and French Governments, but unfortunately, it has not been possible for us, through unavoidable circumstances, to present our case to the Italian and Japanese Governments. In view, however, of the fact that the Supreme Council is now meeting at San Remo and dealing with the Turkish Settlement, the Delegation feel it their duty respectfully to convey to the Supreme Council the chief items of the Muslim mandate.

Firstly, the Mussulmans of India, in common with the vast majority of their co-religionists throughout the world, ask that inasmuch as independent temporal sovereignty with its concomitants of adequate military and economic resources is of the essence of the institution of the Khilafat, the Empire of the Khalifa shall not be dismembered under any pretext. As the Sultan of Turkey is recognised by the vast majority of Mussulmans as Khalifa, what is desired is that the fabric of the Ottoman Empire shall be maintained intact territorially on the basis of the *status quo ante bellum*. But without prejudice to such political changes as give all necessary guarantees consistent with the dignity and independence of the sovereign State for the security of life and

property and opportunities of full autonomous development for all the non-Turkish communities, whether Muslim or non-Muslim, comprised within the Turkish Empire. But on no account is a Muslim majority to be placed under the rule of a non-Muslim minority contrary to the principle of self determination. In behalf of this claim, the Delegation draw the attention of the Supreme Council to (1) the declaration of the British Prime Minister, equally binding on all the Allied and Associated Powers, when on January 5th, 1918, he said: "Nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominatingly Turkish in race," and (2) to President Wilson's twelfth point in his message to the Congress, dated January 8th, 1918, on the basis of which the Armistice with Turkey was signed, and which required that "the Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured of secure sovereignty; that the other nationalities now under Turkish rule should be assured security of life and autonomous development." The Delegation submit that any departure from the pledges and principles set forth above would be regarded by the people of India and the Muslim world generally as a breach of faith. It was on the strength of these and similar assurances that tens of thousands of Indian Mussalmans were induced to lay down their lives in the late war in defence of the Allied cause.

Secondly, we have to submit that the most solemn religious obligations of the Muslim faith require that the area known as the Jazirat-ul-Arab or the "Island of Arabia," which includes, besides the peninsula of Arabia, Syria, Palestine and Mesopotamia, shall continue to be, as heretofore for the last thirteen hundred years, under exclusively Muslim control, and that the Khalifa shall similarly continue to be the Warden and Custodian of the Holy Places and Holy Shrines of Islam, namely, Mecca, Medina, Jerusalem Najaf, Kerbela, Samarra, Kazimain, and Baghdad, all situated within the Jzirat-ul-Arab. Any encroachment upon these sanctuaries of Islam by the inauguration of non-Muslim control in whatever guise or form, whether a Protectorate or Mandate, would be a direct violation of the most binding religious injunctions of Islam and the deepest sentiment of Muslims all the world over, and would, therefore be utterly unacceptable to the Mussulmans of India and the rest of the Indian community. In this connection, apart from the religious obligations to which we refer, the Delegation would draw the attention of the Supreme Council to the Proclamation, issued by the Government of India, on behalf of His Britannic Majesty's Government, as also the Governments of France and Russia, on November 2nd, 1914, in which it was specially declared that "no question of a religious character was involved" in this war, and it was further categorically promised that "the Holy Places of Arabia, including the Holy Shrines

of Mesopotamia and the Port of Jedda will be immune from attack or molestation."

The claims set forth above constitute the irreducible minimum required by the injunctions of the Islamic Faith and the Delegation, as in duty bound, would earnestly impress upon the Supreme Council the fact that any ruthless and unrighteous dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire or any violation of the Holy Land of Islam by the intrusion, in any degree or form, of Christian control in that region, would create a situation fraught with the gravest consequences and reactions for future peace and contentment in the world. What precise form the repercussions may take, it is obviously not possible for the Delegation to forecast. But the Mussulmans of India have already submitted to the British Government that a Turkish Settlement made in disregard of their religious obligations, on respect for which their loyalty has always been strictly conditional, would be regarded by Indian Mussulmans as incompatible with their continued allegiance to the British Crown. That is a contingency which the Mussulmans of India, in common with all their compatriots constituting a population of over three hundred millions, naturally view with the keenest apprehension and anxiety, and are most earnestly desirous of preventing by every means in their power. We believe that the British Government, at any rate, are fully apprised of the range and intensity of public feeling that has been aroused in India on this

question, and we content ourselves, therefore, by simply stating here that the Khilafat movement represents an unprecedented demonstration of national feeling and concern. Only on the 19th March last, the day when the Delegation was received by the British Prime Minister, all business was suspended throughout the continent of India by Mussulmans and Hindu alike, as a reminder and reaffirmation of the Muslim case in respect of the future of the Khilafat. This unprecedented yet peaceful demonstration involved a loss of millions to the public at large and was undertaken solely with the object of impressing the authorities and other concerned with the universality of Indian and Muslim sentiment on the question. If, notwithstanding all constitutional and loyal representations which the Mussulmans of India have put forward on behalf of the obligations imposed upon them by their faith, a settlement is imposed upon Turkey which would be destructive of the very essentials of the Khilafat, a situation would arise in which it would be futile to expect peace and harmony to prevail in India and the Muslim world.

"The Delegation, therefore, feel it their duty most solemnly to urge upon the Supreme Council the desirability of endeavouring to achieve a Peace Settlement with the Ottoman Empire which would be in consonance with the most binding religious obligations and overwhelming sentiments of so large and important section of the world community. The

Delegation would beg even at this late hour, that the Supreme Council may defer taking any final decisions of this question in order to afford to them an opportunity such as they have repeatedly applied for of laying their submission before the Council. In answer to our request to be allowed to appear before the Supreme Council, the British Secretary to the Council intimated to us that only the accredited Governments with whose future the Peace Conference is dealing are allowed to appear before it, and that at the request of the British Government, the official Delegation of India had already been heard. But as we have already represented that the Turkish Settlement, involving as it does the question of the Khilafat, in the preservation of which the Mussulmans of the world are so vitally interested, does not obviously seem to be a question on which the Peace Conference should hear only the Government of territories with whose future they are dealing. In fact, the concern of the Muslim world for the future of the Khilafat, which is the most essential institution of Islam transcends in importance the interests of the various Governments that are being set up in different parts of the Khilafat territories, and the Delegation trust that no technical objection would be allowed to stand in the way of doing justice and securing peace. A concern that is so vital and affects so large a portion of humanity inhabiting several continents and that arises from a feeling deeper than patriotism and yet not, territorial in its

essence, cannot, in view of the Delegation, be ignored by the Peace Conference in arranging a settlement of the world's affairs to which it attaches any degree of finality and by means of which it hopes to restore once more the sway of peace over mankind. With reference to the official Delegation of India, which the Supreme Council has already heard, the Indian Khilafat Delegation would invite the attention of the Council to the fact so far at least, the State and the nation are not one in India, and the Delegation submit that a nation numbering more than 315 millions of people is entitled to a hearing before a final decision is taken on a question that has incontestably acquired a national status. The Delegation hope that they may without any disrespect to the members comprising the official Delegation of India, also refer to the fact that no Indian Mussulman was represented on the Delegation in spite of Muslim protests. Since the Indian Khilafat Delegation are here to urge a full and fair consideration of the religious obligations of the Mussulmans who acknowledge His Majesty the Sultan of Turkey as the Successor of the Prophet and Commander of the Faithful, and have been deputed by the Indian nation to represent its views before the Peace Conference, the Delegation hope that the Supreme Council will enable them to explain these obligations and views. If an opportunity such as they desire is not given them, it is likely to create a sense of injustice in the vast populations that are vitally inter-

ested in the success of the mission of peace and reconciliation with which the Delegation have been charged. This will defeat the purpose of the Peace Conference itself which must obviously be to reconcile its decisions to the conscience of mankind."

British Delegation,

Hotel Royal, San Remo,

April 20th 1920.

Sir,—I am directed by Mr. Lloyd George to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of April 9th asking that the Indian Khilafat Delegation may be given an opportunity of expressing their views before the Supreme Council of the Peace Conference.

In reply I am directed to confirm my telegram of even date stating that the Supreme Council have considered your letter and are unable to re-consider the decision conveyed in my letter of April 7th.

With reference to the last paragraph of your letter I am directed to state that as the main questions relating to the Treaty of Peace with Turkey have now been decided the Prime Minister does not think that any useful purpose will be served by a fresh hearing of your Delegation.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Sd.) M. P. A HANKEY,

The Secretary.

British Secretary,

Indian Khilafat Delegation,

TELEGRAM: 22ND APRIL, 1920.

To Supreme Council of Peace Conference,

San Remo.

Very largely attended meeting of citizens of the British Empire, held to-night at Kingsway Hall, under the Chairmanship of Mr. George Lansbury, passed the following resolution :—

“That this meeting urges upon the Government the necessity for taking into serious consideration, in the Turkish Settlement, the religious obligations of the Mussulmans, who in India alone number some seventy million citizens of the British Empire, and the national sentiment of United India ; and this meeting instructs Mr. Mohamed Ali, Head of the Indian Khilafat Delegation, to communicate to the Prime Minister by wire the meeting's demand that no final decisions should be taken with regard to the Turkish Settlement before the Delegation had been heard by the Peace Conference.

TELEGRAM: 24TH APRIL, 1920.

To Supreme Council of Peace Conference,

San Remo.

The Indian Khilafat Delegation have received the letter of the British Secretary of the Supreme Council, dated San Remo, 20th April, and greatly regret that the Council, while giving a hearing to a number of delegations representing at best microscopic populations inhabiting meagre areas and per-

mitting the Premier of Greece, which was not at war with Turkey, to take part in the discussions relating to the Turkish Settlement, should have ignored the claims of a nation numbering more than 315 millions of people inhabiting the vast sub-continent of India even to a hearing, and should have denied the right of several hundred millions more in the rest of the world professing the Muslim faith to express their views on the question involving the disintegration of the Khilafat. In the name of our compatriots and co-religionists we deem it to be our duty once more to point out to the Government of Great Britain and to her Allies that it would be perfectly futile to expect peace and tranquillity if, to the humiliating disregard of the overwhelming national sentiment of India, which would in any case lessen the value of citizenship of the British Empire to the Indian people, is added, as a result of the secret diplomacy of a few persons, however exalted and eminent, who are now settling the fate of Islam behind closed doors, a contemptuous disregard of the most binding and solemn religious obligations imposed on Muslims by their faith. But the grave responsibility for re-opening the chapter of international discord and strife which the world had eagerly hoped was closed, at least for a long time to come, when the Armistice was signed on the basis of President Wilson's fourteen points, would lie with a Peace Conference that professedly sat for the settlement of Peace yet would have achieved nothing beyond a distribution of

the spoils of war. The Delegation feel bound to protest once more against the occupation of Constantinople, by British military and naval forces, in the name of the Allies, as an act which has placed the Khalifa in duress and against the arrest and deportation of the Sheikh-ul-Islam, who would not prostitute the functions of his high office at the bidding of superior force and other similarly coercive measures directed against the Khilafat. These measures can only be regarded by Muslims as an outrage upon their faith and have already created a revulsion of feeling against the Allies, not only in Turkey but throughout the Muslim world and the East generally which, unless checked by a speedy and complete repudiation of the policy which they stand for, must lead to immeasurably grievous consequences. The people of India—Hindoos and Muslims alike which we have the honour to represent will never acquiesce in any perpetuation, overt or covert, of such a policy that may be sought to be incorporated in the Peace Treaty. In view of the grave perils that we foresee we once more earnestly beg the Supreme Council not to disregard the claims of prudence as well as of justice at this critical juncture and not to delude itself with the hope that the sway of peace would be restored merely because in secret conclave it laid down the law for the world or that the armed might of the Allies could coerce the conscience of mankind. Representatives of great and historic nations who had condemned the doctrine

that Might is Right in no mistakable terms should not, assuredly, seek in naked force the sanction for their settlement of the world's affairs.

Mohamed Ali, Syud Hossain, Syed Sulaiman Nadvi. Indian Khilafat Delegation.

KINGSWAY HALL MEETING.

MR. GEORGE LANSBURY'S WARNING.

A very successful and well attended meeting was held under the presidentship of Mr. George Lansbury in the Kingsway Hall on April 22, 1920, at which the Indian Khilafat Delegation very eloquently and convincingly put the Indian Muslim case regarding the Khilafat. There were other Indian and English sympathisers of Islam who spoke in support of the demands of the Mussulmans of India.

MR. GEORGE LANSBURY : Ladies and Gentlemen. We meet here to-night to hear a statement of the case of our Muslim friends here in regard to the proposed settlement that certain gentlemen connected with this end of Europe propose to make with the other end of Europe. I suppose when the history of the past two or three years comes to be written the historian will reckon that it was rather extraordinary in an age when democracy was supposed to rule, that the destiny of millions of men, women and children was settled by two or three rather aged gentlemen meeting either in Italy or some other sort of place. I

think the colossal impudence of the Big Three and the little dozen and all the other kind of hangers-on, the colossal impudence of these people in re-making the map of the world and handling nationalities the sort of Government not that the nationalities desire, but what these gentlemen think is good for them, is incredible.

In the good old days of downright autocracy, we all recognised the autocrat among us who knew what was good for us better than we know ourselves ; but in these days so-called democratic statesmen meet together without consulting a single soul and decide the fate of the world. The worst of it is that in making these decisions these gentlemen have certain interests that in days long ago even the autocrats had not. We know now that oil is in a certain place and is very valuable, and we know that that fact has more to do with determining the sort of Government that certain people shall live under than any other. And I suppose the historian will say that for downright cynicism and hypocrisy there never has been such a Treaty or series of Treaties that is proposed to be carried into effect in the name of democracy.

When I was asked to come here and take the chair, I did so for two or three very clear reasons. First, I have no sort of feeling about men or women as to where they are born. I do not like our friends on the platform any more than I like you down there. I like men and women, and it does not matter

whether they are born in Turkey or in any other country ; and then there is this further fact, that the country in which I happen to be born, and which I am very fond of, has allocated to itself the responsibility of determining how about three hundred millions of people shall live in India. I hope the day will come when the Indians will either persuade us or in some other way get rid of our rule over them.

I think that to-day we Englishmen have tremendous responsibilities in regard to our Muslim fellow-citizens. I know that religious bigotry and intolerance is about the worst kind that it is possible to think of, and I know it is not confined more to one section of religion than to another. Most religious people are rather bigoted. Some people think I am. I probably am, but I am only like the average man in this respect. But I think that those people must realise that there are many millions of their supposed to be fellow-citizens in India to whom whatever settlement is made of the Turkish Empire will be of supreme importance ; and just as we white people here, who are Protestants if you will, would not view with any very great favour, but with extreme disfavour, the removal of our co-religionists from all power and control over certain parts of the world in which they formerly had control and lived, then we are bound to consider that the Muslims in India have a very good case to interfere in the settlement made in regard to Turkey.

I cannot for the life of me understand how any set of people that was at all trying to understand the feelings of other people could have any other feelings than I think I have on the subject. If I were a Roman Catholic, and it was proposed to do something that would in the judgment of Roman Catholics desecrate St. Peter's at Rome, I, although not near Italy, should be up in arms against it, and I can quite understand the Muslim holding the same view, and I think everyone of us ought to do our level best to enable our friends who have come here to enlighten the British people, and do everything in our power to assist them to do so. That was the first reason that prompted me to accept the invitation.

Another reason is, I do not believe myself that we shall ever get a proper settlement of the affairs of the world until we get of the idea of race inequality. I protested and I protest now against what are called the subject races being used to fight the battles of the supposed superior races. I object very strongly to people being brought from all the ends of the earth to fight for us superior beings. *If the day has come when we cannot fight for ourselves or hold our own position in the world, it is time we gave up wanting to hold any position in the world.*

Further than that, I think there will be no true peace in the world until mankind is ready to concede to one another the ordinary rights that each asks for himself. I want no right that I am not willing to

share with our friends on the platform and I ask for no privilege from their country that I am not prepared they should share here. I think it is downright impudence on the part of any part of the British Dominions to put up a bar against Indians because of their race or colour. *If white men are going to poke their noses into every corner of the globe, the other people have the right to poke their noses into every part of the globe too.* We have got to get down to the real bedrock with regard to these matters.

One of the first speeches that I heard Mr. Gladstone make was in Newman Hall, in Newman Street. It was on this eternal question of Constantinople and the Turkish Empire. I have learnt a good deal since the days when I was a boy and yelled myself hoarse over the "Grand Old Man." I have learnt that what are called the strategic parts of the world are wanted to be held in these days for commercial purposes. I believe that Lenin is quite right when he says that strategic frontiers are only necessary when to get something from your neighbour which you should not want to get. The holding of Constantinople, which I understand is a lovely place, is a vital question of this description. Why is there all this row about it? Why, should anyone want to prevent anyone else from going there? Only because somebody might selfishly want to keep somebody else out of something they want to hold for their own advantage. I believe the world will

not be safe for democracy until the whole world is open for democracy, with nobody trying to prevent others from going where they please. I want the world thrown open to men and women, and the natural resources of each country to be at the disposal of the whole world. I believe there is plenty in the world for everybody. I want to tell the gentlemen who make oil the cause of wars and at the same time destroy oil wells in Roumania, and also the monopolists, that as far as we are concerned there will be monopoly anywhere, but that all the natural resources of the world should be at the disposal of everybody.

I am here because I hope I am a democrat, and my democracy means that it is something that shall be applied to any part of the world, and I do not recognise that I know better what is good for people in Turkey than they do themselves. I want everybody to settle their own lives in their own way, and that is really the main reason why I am here this evening.

COLONEL WEDGWOOD, M.P.: The Chairman, my friends,—I think the conveners of this meeting are to be congratulated upon getting together such a magnificent audience to-night from people who are not directly affected by the subject to be discussed, and in whether it is not fit for a cat to be out in. I am not at all certain that they ought to be congratulated on having got me here. If there is one thing I hate on this earth, it is religion. I mean the sort

of thing that calls itself religion and means hating everybody else that does not happen to share their religion. The world would be much better off if they were all scrapped.

As a matter of fact, I rather like the Turks. (Cheers.) They are the best of all the East European nations. (Cheers.) It is not saying much ; but it is something. Almost to a day five years ago I was lying behind the bulwarks of the "River Clyde," looking out of the machine-gun port hole, the just about as far away as the back of the hall was a spit of rock covered with wounded men so that you could not see the rock, and there were two men in a boat, Englishmen, trying to get them into the boat and back to the ship. Within three hundred yards of those Englishmen and that spit of rock were at least a thousand Turks lying behind rides. At any moment those men could have been shot down, and for half an hour at least, with occasional bursts of fire, they allowed those men to live and get the wounded into the boat. (Loud cheers.) I have seen fighting, on nearly every front. I defy you to try to match that as an example of mercy to people who are absolutely at the mercy of their enemies. (Loud cheers.) The Turk is a clean fighter because he is a brave man—(cheers)—and whatever else we may think we know that a brave man generally has other virtues ; because cowardice is the foundation of all vices. (Cheers.)

I say I do not like religious fanaticism, and just

at the present I think we must even at a meeting like this refer to what religious fanaticism is bringing upon the East at the present time. Poland, Hungary, Roumania, all those countriets of the East, and now even in Turkey, you have those wretched pogroms against the Jews, just inspired by apologies, calling themselves Christian Nationals. Whether they are Christian or Muslim, I believe the best place for these people to be in it a strait waistcoat, and to have a dose of bromide administered to them until they foam at the mouth. (Laughter.)

I am here to-night because I love the Indians. (Cheers.) They are my sort. (Cheers.) They, too, have been kicked and bullied through the ages, and I do not think they have ever bullied anybody. (Cheers.) Hindus and Muslims, whatever their religion, they are probably true Indians first, and the time will come, I hope it will come soon, when they will forget they are Indians and remember only that they are citizens of the world. (Cheers.) In my opinion all British citizens and your seventy millions in India of British citizens who happen to be Muslim in faith, and those seventy millions have a right to have their voice heard in this country, have a right to expect that the ruler of the British Empire should respect their views as well as the views of every other form of British citizens. During the war he gave a certain pledge. At the time I was doubtful whether it was a pledge or merely a method of getting Turkey out of the war. In the House of

/

Commons the other day we were told by the Prime Minister that it was a pledge, and that therefore the Government could not take Constantinople from Turkish rule. If it was doubtful whether it was a pledge before, at any rate, it is certain now. We have got to see that that pledge is kept and that Constantinople is not taken from the Turks. (Cheers.) We have got to see that a place like Smyrna, too, is not handed over to another race or religion merely because there happen to be alien troops there, (Cheers.) The ancient homelands of the Turks are as much the right and property of the Turks as England is of the Englishmen. (Cheers.) [A Voice : "when did they get it?" Wedgwood : "They got it in 1346, a considerable time before we got British India." (Loud cheers and laughter.)

I am not going to take up your time with that to-night. My object here to-night is to back you people. What I would point out to you Indians, whether you are Muslim or whether you are Hindu, is, you have a right to a say in the management of the British Empire. You have not got that power yet. You are getting it. Do not throw everything away by foolhardy attempts at armed revolution in order to secure any thing at all. That is not the weapon of sensible men and that is not the weapon which will right things.

MR. SYED HOSSAIN : Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen,—The question that has been discussed this evening, as you will have gathered, is a

pretty extensive as well as complicated one. My task of supporting the resolution is not altogether an easy one, for I have been trying to think of one or two points that might conceivably have been left untouched by the preceeding speakers. (Laughter.) While, therefore, from one point of view there is not very much for me to add, from another there is, I fear, almost too much to be said. I shall take up haphazard the last point of the last speaker, who warned us as well as implored us not to think of an armed revolution. I think I can completely set his mind and the minds of all of you at rest on that question. There can be no armed revolution in India for the good reason that the British rulers of India have taken good care to see that the entire population of India is disarmed. So that we may put that apprehension on one side. I may, however, add in regard to this very point, that so far as the people of India are concerned, they have no wish, temperamentally and traditionally, for any kind of violence on their fellow men.

That brings me to the specific question that has brought us all together this evening, the question of the Khilafat. What is that question? Put very briefly it is simply this, that you have got in India to-day over seventy millions of people who owe their allegiance to the Islamic faith. It is open to every person here and outside this hall to regard this particular allegiance from an academic point of view, as an act of folly. I have no quarrel with that

point of view. But we have got to take it as a fact that so many millions of people who happen to be British citizens, and whom, moreover, British statesmen in moods of Imperialist exuberance or hours of Imperial peril, have been at the pains to remind them of the fact of their British citizenship—these seventy millions of the people of India who are Muslims recognise the Sultan of Turkey. Those of you who know anything about Islam probably know that Islamic history consists of a matter of fourteen hundred years throughout which, since the death of the Prophet, there has been such a thing as the Khilafat. The Khalif is the living symbol of the temporal and cultural power of Islam.

For the first time in the history of British rule in India this question has arisen, because until now the Khilafat of Islam was never put in jeopardy. To-day it has been put in jeopardy because as part of the universal reconstruction that is supposed to have begun after the Great War it is sought to consign the Khilafat to the melting pot. Now the Khilafat does not lend itself to that species of experience. If Islam is to remain a world-factor, I do not wish to use the phrase a world-force, the integrity and unity of the Khilafat, as heretofore, must be maintained intact.

In regard to the office of Khalif the first essential is that he should be an independent temporal sovereign, capable of fulfilling the role of Defender of the Faith. If he cannot be independent and

cannot be in a position to maintain himself as an independent temporal monarch, he cannot be the "Commander of the Faithful" so far as Muslims are concerned.

We are up against a proposal at this moment that aims at reducing the Khalif of two hundred and fifty millions of the world's population to the status of a dummy or a figurehead under the familiar aegis of one or another of the great Christian Powers of Europe.

That is a proposal which, as far as the Muslim world and India are concerned must be unconditionally and uncompromisingly rejected. The Khilafat shall not perish. That is our first claim.

The second is this, that the area known as "Jazirat-ul-Arab," which is an Arabic phrase which simply means: "The Island of Arabia," or to put it in a more general way, the Holy Land of Islam—this area which includes all the Holy Places and Shrines of Islam, this land shall not pass into non-Muslim control or custody of any sort or kind. (Cheers.) You may regard this particular infatuation on the part of the millions of your Muslim fellow-citizens of the British Empire as absurd. None the less it is an incontrovertible fact that they do feel in that way, and to them the question is one that transcends all others. What we ask is that this region—the cradle and sanctuary of Islam—that has for so long remained under uninterrupted Islamic custody and control,

shall not be thrown open to European exploitation or imperialistic greed. (Cheers.) Even if there were no religious objections to throwing open the Holy Land of Islam to European exploitation the East would still be utterly opposed to such designs on grounds of national and international morality. The Holy Land is to be wrested from Muslims because, forsooth, there is oil in Mosul, and there are rich undeveloped resources in Mesopotamia, as Mr. Lloyd George in a weak moment proclaimed the other day.

Well, you cannot reconcile two things with reference to this issue. Either you are going to have oil in Mosul or the loyalty of the Muslims of India. You cannot have both. That has got to be clearly understood in this matter. That is the issue in respect of the Holy Land of Islam. Who are the people who have sent us to speak to you on their behalf? They are the people who came and fought shoulder to shoulder with you in the hour of your trial and trouble. Tens of thousands of Muslims alone laid down their lives in defence of the British Empire and the Allied cause. You were not too proud then to ask for our co-operation, to ask us to lay down our lives for you and your cause ; but now when the corner has been turned, when peace and reconstruction are supposed to be engrossing the attention of your statesmen and Ministers, the national sentiment of our people is not deemed sufficiently important to receive even

the patient hearing of Mr. Lloyd George. (Shame.) That is all very well as a manifestation of power. It is a very excellent gesture in Imperialism! But the thing I have got to put before you is this. That may be all very well from the histrionic point of view; it is not the way that you British men and women are going to build up an enduring peace in the world. (Cheers.) Are you going to build your future, the future of the British Empire and the British Commonwealth, are you going to build the peace of the world upon no cleaner or more righteous foundation than that of the negation of the deepest religious obligations of seventy millions of people whom you yourself are proud to claim as British citizens? (cheer).

Colonel Wedgwood has gone away. As my friend, Mohamed Ali, reminded you, he is a man for whom every Indian has nothing but genuine esteem and respect. But just to show you how even so well-meaning and so splendid a friend of ours is capable of going wrong, I will recall what he said the other day in the House of Commons, in contending against an imaginary assumption that anyone of us had come here to threaten the British public. People who want to threaten do not take a journey of thousands of miles: it can be as well done at home as abroad (Laughter.) If we had wanted to threaten you, we should not have wasted our own time and yours to explain things to you from a public platform. (Cheers.) Colonel Wedgwood said,

“Really, really, what can they threaten us with?” As I began by saying, it is very cheap to make that kind of query in respect of a population which is disarmed. Suppose Great Britain had not prevented arms and munitions from being imported into India, it might have been possible to answer that question differently. But taking the facts as they are, if we cannot threaten you with armed resistance, that is the measure of our impotence and emasculation as British citizens. I make a present of that fact to you. But I should like to ask you, is that not also a measure of the essentially immoral and coercive character of your regime in India? (Cheers.)

Let us wish to conclude with this, that so far as this particular question of the Khilafat is concerned, I wish you would take it from us who have been deputed to come and give this message to you, that the Muslims and people of India at large are not prepared to accept any scheme of settlement or reconstruction of the Ottoman Empire which does not take into full consideration the binding, solemn, religious obligations of our people. And as I have told you, there is nothing which really stands in the way of a just and honourable settlement of this question ; nothing, so far as any of us has been able to discover, but the same old Imperialistic fanaticism and mania for exploitation which led the world into the Great War, and which, if you are not careful, will involve the world, as much to our misery and anguish as to your own, into another and worse

Armageddon, because it will be aggravated by religious passions. This last war was supposed to be the war to end war. I leave it to you to consider how far that fond hope has proved true. At the present moment Mr. Lloyd George and the rest of the Big Three at San Remo are supposed to be devising a peace. All I can say in respect of that peace is that it looks uncommonly like a peace that is going to end peace. (Cheers.)

We have just returned to London from a visit to Paris, and although this is neither the time nor occasion for me to detail my impressions of what I gathered in Paris from quite responsible people, one thing I may mention. If Mr. Lloyd George were to have his way in regard to the Peace Settlement, not only with Turkey but the world at large then certainly the Peace of San Remo will be the Peace to end Peace. But I have neither the mandate nor have I the wish to claim to speak for any one else. As far as my people are concerned, and I make no distinction of Hindu or Muslim, take it from me that, to make the issue a concrete one, if you are going to have a British mandate in Mesopotamia, and if you are going to be a party to the ruthless and unrighteous dismemberment of the Empire of the Khalif, who is the living symbol of the hope and faith of hundreds of millions—the day you are a party to that kind of political transaction, that day we Muslims of India, and I hope the rest of the

Indian community, shall regard ourselves as absolved from the duty of loyalty to the British Crown.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is not my private opinion or any personal predilection. This is the solemn, well-thought out, considered position which millions of our people have taken up, and which we were charged formally to bring to the notice of the British Government and people. The day when the British Government can be a party to so unrighteous a course as that which I have indicated, that day we shall deliberately regard ourselves, in accordance with the injunctions of our faith as absolved from that debt of loyal allegiance which we have honourably and in all fidelity observed and maintained so far. (Cheers.)

MRS. DESPARD: MR. LANSBURY and Friends: I must begin by saying how very glad I am to find myself upon this platform this evening. I am glad as a British woman, because it is a question not for men only, it is a question for women—this question of what is to bring to us peace, to hear about the (I may say) passionate interest that the women of India are taking in this question. I am glad to have an opportunity of giving expression to my deepest sympathy with my Indian brothers and sisters and also that the crisis, which seems at the present moment so threatening, may be passed through safely for us all. This is an hour of crisis. There are moments at times when my heart almost ceases, when it seems to me that we are being plunged into

the gulf of a tragedy the awfulness of which few of us can imagine or recognise in the very least. The unhappy part of it is that it is the tragedy not of war but of peace. Rather, because I do not think I should use that noble word in such a connection altogether, rather the semblance of peace which is in reality behind it.

Just about eighteen months ago on the 11th November, that memorable day of 1918, we were laughing and singing and rejoicing and weeping. We had our hearts quite full of enthusiasm, we thought that the end of the terrible tragedy had come, we should be able to begin the great work of reconstruction for all the nations of the world, and we had a right to think that too, because, as we must not forget, the Armistice was signed on certain conditions. The Germans put down their arms because they were asked to accept certain principles. What were those principles? The first principle was that of which we have heard this evening in the exceedingly impressive speeches, and through which the feelings of our Muslim fellow citizens have been brought before us. The first is self-determination, the right of every nation to its own traditions, own religion, characteristics, education, own language—everything that makes it a nation. Bit by bit we have seen the way that our men in authority have taken. It is greatly our own fault here in Great Britain. It is through the apathy of the workers, all those who had really and truly begun to understand

what progress really means, and that without international solidarity we shall never have the real peace. It is purely our fault that things are as they are. It is through our fault that the great three are up there at San Remo wrangling, I hear, at the present moment, unable to come to any settlement about that which has been done (not about a single cruelty that was done by that cruel blockade and the breaking of every principle), as we are speaking this evening for and with our Indian fellow-citizens, and their very moderate, very temperate resolution which is before us. What is it they are asking of in that resolution? What we are all asking for, that the religious and national feeling of these great myriads of people shall be respected ; that in the settlement that is being come to, no outrage shall be done to them.

Colonel Wedgwood spoke about scrapping all religions. It is not the religions I want to scrap, it is the methods of the religionists. When we come to think of it religion is the very deepest thing in the lives of most of us. It is racial to begin with. We have insulted the religion which we love or profess to love and which we associate with the very earliest memories of our childhood we carry with us these days.

One of the discoveries of the modern age made by learned men ,one of the truths that they have brought back is that, as a fact, all the great religions of the world come from the same source. That if

we look back to the origins of these religions we shall find the same great truths and also the same immortal teachings. If I had time I could give you instance after instance, quotations from sacred writings, saying much the same as quotations from the writings that are sacred to us. When I look back upon the great history of the Muslim faith, when I think of the civilisations that started then, the state of Arabia, the state of the East, of the corruption that existed, and then how an order was developed, how a great civilisation was born, how a splendid art was developed, I say we ought to have every respect for those who follow that religion, and in endeavouring to outrage that religion we in this country and all the other countries are taking upon ourselves a great and terrible responsibility. And, therefore, it is, I hope, although we have gone wrong in other matters, that in this we shall do the right thing. It is not only from the political point of view I speak, but even from a larger point of view. I have a deeper thought, a higher hope. My hope is the coming of the different nations together. My hope is for a mutual understanding through which alone we will be able to achieve a lasting peace, and the East and the West must come together. It is a very strange thing that we should be talking about the East and the religion of the East. We seem to think our religion was founded in the West. It was not. Our religion that has proved a civilising standard for the West, it came

from the East. It is the East that has been the parent of the great religions, and I have a profound belief that East and West must come together in a closer union than they ever have approached yet, and that may be the secret of our strange entry into India. It may be that we shall have higher and better men ruling our destinies here, and then Great Britain may come together with India and all that India means, and that may mean the salvation of the world. And, therefore, I am always glad of an opportunity to stand upon such a platform as this, and, therefore, it is I keenly and deeply desire that our nations shall in this particular issue see clearly and act readily, and I am perfectly convinced that will be for the benefit of us all.

MR. B. G. HORNIMAN: MR. LANSBURY, Ladies and Gentlemen:—It gives me very great pleasure to support this resolution, which it appears to me states in very simple terms the most elementary duty which the British people owe to the Indian people in regard to the settlement of the peace treaty with Turkey. The only criticism that I have to make of Mr. Mohamed Ali and his colleagues is that they appear to me to be a great deal too modest in the statement of their claims. I do not know why Mr. Mohamed Ali should come here and say that the Muslims of India do not want to dictate the foreign policy of the Empire. I say that in this matter of the settlement of the Peace Treaty with Turkey, the Muslims of India at least have a greater claim to

dictate the policy of the Empire than any other section of the people, and not only the Muslims of India, but the whole of the people of India. Their interest in regard to the preservation or the dismemberment of the Turkish Empire is much greater than any interest to which the British people can lay claim to in that particular quarter of the world. That is the first point. Secondly we are under such infinite obligations to the Indian people for all they have done for us, for all we owe to them, that it is a matter almost of treachery and betrayal to think that we shall not give them the first voice in settling a business of this kind which affects them so closely. The obligations which we owe to the Indian people are not merely concerned with what they did in the late war, great as that may have been. They go back over the whole period of the last 150 years during which the British Empire has been built up by the wealth which we have drawn from India, and which has played the greater part, the greatest part of all, in enabling these great self-governing dominions of which we are so proud to grow up under the aegis of a great imperial power for the protection of which they have contributed nothing through all that time.

Lord Hardinge said during the first few months of the war that India was bled for the aid of the Empire. That bleeding process did not begin with the first few months of the war, but it has been going on for 150 years. During the whole period from the

very first moment when we went to India we have been bleeding the people of India, that it was an absolute miracle that when the war came there should have been anything left to bleed at all. What did they do in the war? They not only fought, they not only fought for the freedom of little nations, but to win, to enable England to win and preserve her own freedom which was at stake. They came to the aid of the British Empire and its Allies at almost every critical stage in the war. All that must be such stale news to you that it is not necessary for me to go into any detail. They played the greater part in the conquest of Palestine and Mesopotamin, and they played that part under most solemn pledges that were made to them from the very beginning, that the Khilafat was not to be disintegrated and that the sacred places of the Islamic faith, the Island of Arabia, were going to be preserved to Islam. After all that surely it is not too much to say that when the war has come to an end, when we have used the youth and manhood of their country, when we have allowed them to spill their blood, to spend their treasure, when we have bled them white, in Lord Hardinge's words, it is not too much to say that they should be allowed the first voice in settling the terms of peace with Turkey. And I say that so far from Mr. Mohamed Ali and his colleagues having to come here and plead before audiences of this kind, to have to come here to plead for the cause of Islam, for the preservation of their faith, for respect being shown

to their religious obligations, they ought to be at San Remo playing the chief part in advising Mr. Lloyd George.

I only want to say two things in conclusion, and the first is this. India, as you know, has been reaping a most abundant harvest from the victory gained in the war. First of all when the war came to an end, the war which she had fought to preserve Great Britain's freedom, she got the Rowlatt Act; then after the Rowlatt Act the Indian people got all the horrors of martial law in the Punjab. They got General Dyer at Amritsar and Colonel Johnson and all the other "unrighteous characters," as H. G. Wells very properly described them. If on top of that great betrayal which has already taken place of the trust and confidence the Indian people reposed in us during the war; if on top of that we are going to add the betrayal of the most solemn pledges that were made to them in regard to this question of Turkey, I want to emphasise what has already been said by Mr. Mohamed Ali and Mr. Syad Hossain, and speaking with the authority I claim to have in this matter, knowing that we say nothing less than the truth, I want to warn you if that is done it will break the last link in the chain that has hitherto bound the Indian people to the British Empire. I want to warn you because I honestly believe that the connection between the Indian people and the British Empire is one which in the interests of both us, and them it is most important, is absolutely essential,

to preserve. I am not speaking from the point of view of an imperialist or everything that is known by imperialism, but because I believe that in an honest, equal, self-respecting alliance between the people of India and the people of this country, between the workers of India and the workers of this country, because I believe that in that lies one of the most important steps to that ultimate federation of the people, of the progress of the world, to which I am sure we all in this hall look forward as a great consummation of the world's happiness and progress.

The second thing which I want to be allowed to say in conclusion is this. Attempts have been made by the "Times" newspaper and in other quarters to describe our friends here to-night, who have come here not only representing the Muslims of India, but the whole of India in this matter; I forget what the "Times" said about them; the intention was to suggest that they are not people's representative of opinion in India. I want to tell you here to-night that Mr. Mohammed Ali and Mr. Syud Hossain and Mr. Nadvi were appointed as delegates to come to this country, by what I undertake to say was the most representative conference that has ever been held in India. I do not suppose that any body of people that has ever met in that country to consider any public question, has been one of such authority and of such a widely representative character as the Khilafat Conference which appointed these

gentlemen to come to put before the whole of Europe the question of the Khilafat. It was a conference in which every kind of party was represented, moderate or extremist. It was a conference in which the Hindu leaders, the most important Hindu leaders, as well as the most important Hindus of India are as solidly behind our friends here to-night as their own co-religionists the Mahomedans, because the Hindus recognise in this matter that such a betrayal of their co-religionists as a treaty with Turkey which did not respect their faith would involve, is as much a blow to them as it is a blow to the Mahomedans.

I can only say finally that if Mr. Lloyd George had the same claim to represent the opinion of England as our friends here have to represent the opinion of India, he would enjoy a position of much higher respect than he does.

MRS. NAIDU :—FRIENDS :—

It is not a speech that you are going to hear from me to-day—it is the message of the spirit of India, the warning of the spirit of India, that challenge of the spirit of India, the prophecy of the spirit of India, all these things focussed together in one statement, and that is the indivisible destiny of the Indian people in life or in death.

Mr. Mohamed Ali has spoken to you of one invincible assent of the Indian people, their determination to die in defence of their national sentiments. But I am not ready to die, because I think it requires an infinitely higher courage to live. I

refuse to let Europe think that we have only the courage of despair. We have the courage of the right and the just on our side, and we must prevail, even though that victory be measured in terms higher than Imperialistic Europe can realise or appreciate. For our victory—for we refuse to think of anything less than victory—might indeed mean death of a kind to us, but it shall also mean a legacy of stainless pride left to the unborn generations on whose defence we, an indivisible people, lay our challenge to the peace of Europe that does not understand.

I am not a Muslim, I am the descendant of centuries upon centuries of pure Brahminical blood. Brahmins are supposed by Euroean historians to be the hereditary enemies of the Muslims. For once the deductions of historians are wrong. For once history has proved miraculous in joining together what civilisations and religions might be supposed to divide for ever. For we to-day, Hindus and Muslims, after centuries upon centuries of conflict, hatred, division, enmities, are at last reconciled in an invincible harmony and unity, welded together in the flame of a common national name, aspiring together to the stars in one flame of national patriotism and aspiration and hope.

Though we are asking to-day that the religious sentiment of the Muslims be respected in the decision about the Turkish Empire, it is not the demand of a slave people for concessions or of people asking reward and recompense for mere commercial

alliances. We do not ask for rewards for our magnanimity towards you in your time of crisis, we do not ask for recompense because we stayed our hands when you lay in peril of annihilation. No, we ask but that thing which is our human birth-right : justice; only justice, refusing with the haughtiness of a brave people to accept anything but justice, or what might in your definitions be termed generous reward. What right have you or any people on this earth to determine the fate of any race because it has lost against you in the mere incidents of battle results? What is it that you want to destroy? You want to destroy that which stands to-day as the only living symbol of that democracy towards which you are now striving. For remember that what you dream to-day not merely dreamt but fulfilled fourteen hundred years ago, when lonely dreamer of the desert, communing with the stars, first realised the brotherhood of man, the right of every individual to freedom and equality. That camel-driver in the desert was the only true begetter of human democracy such as you are blindly groping towards in modern times.

You talk of destroying the Turkish Empire. I do not care for mere words; Turkish or European or Egyptian, I care for the honour of democratic Islam; I care for the honour of that great religion that has added dynamic power to human progress. I care for that all-conquering faith that marched into barbarous Europe bearing the light of learning to

human civilisations (omitted through applause) the of achievement, as one said speaking of the march of this lovely civilisation, were that it went on civilising from Persia's Shrines to Catholic Spain, for (applause) valley, and coming to conquer, stayed to succour and love the children of India, the homeland of my name. Live and let live. Keep your Empire if you can. Let the Turkish Empire settle its own destiny. Who are you to say that this unit of the Ottoman Empire shall be isolated and that part of the Ottoman Empire shall be devastated? Let the Muslims settle their own quarters! Leave them to live or die! Leave them to dispose their Khalifa from Constantinople. If he be unworthy to be a successor of the great Prophet, let them say this man is not worthy! We shall go back to the time when our Khalifas were indeed chosen by the democratic vote of a whole people. Let them say we shall depose this king and put that beggar from the street upon the throne of the Khilafat, because he is the true symbol of the great king! Is it for a Christian nation to dictate as to whom should be the symbol of the Islam of the Muslim of the world? Is it for a Welshman from his little Celtic parish to say who shall or who shall not be it? My friend and comrade of many years, Mr. Hossain, has told you with that authority that is born of sincere conviction that the day you set your seal and sign upon an agreement that destroys the integrity of the

Ottoman Empire you have set the sign and seal of your own disintegration, for we shall indeed prove that our deed is not less than our word. Having said that our connection with Britain depends upon this critical supreme issue, we shall stand pledged to fulfil our word.

Friends, you do not know what intensity of religious feeling can mean. When the Armistice was signed, when the representatives of the Viceroy in India held a great reception to receive the congratulations of Indians upon that great occasion, in one Muslim city—praise be to the courage of the women of that city—they wrote and said: "It is an outrage upon our religious feeling that we Muslim women should be asked to go and take part in the rejoicings of the Allies that have outraged the feelings of Turkey." Although lowly women, women behind the veil, who did not know politics, who have never measured themselves against any commercial or worldly standards, they had only that divine quality of humanity, loyalty to an ideal; and for the sake of their ideal they risked official favour and the future of their sons and husbands. Shall the men of India be less than their sisters? In speaking to-day I speak in many capacities: as myself, as a Hindu, as an Indian, but, most of all, believe me, and not for the first time in my life, as the voice of the Muslim women of India. And the Muslim women of India say that we who have borne sons through our

own agony have the right to determine how our sons shall live or die. Better death chivalrous and noble and loyalty to the great word of Islam than live bearing the ban of traitor, coward, fool; and that is what the men of India will be, Hindus and Muslims alike, if they fail to fulfil the pledge they have made in the hour of their supreme emotion. If they draw back, we the women, will not draw back. We shall know how to die, partly in loyalty to an ideal, partly in shame for the lost manhood of our sons. But I have no fear. India, new India, India remembering the glory of the past, India eager to hand down glory to the future—India will stand true to the pledge she has made to herself and the world. Let the Allies at San Remo play their chess upon the political chess-board of the world. There is something greater than the political chess-boards; there is something bigger than human bonds to be moved by the autocracy of a three-fold treacherous people. (I do not stop to pick and choose language politely to-night.) It would be treachery, indeed three-fold treachery, to the world. India will not be a party to that treachery. Let San Remo be, if it choose, the beacon-fire, the bonfire of the peace of the world; but we shall keep alive the torch of our own faith, our own patriotism, and when the bonfires have died down and the world is in ashes we shall rekindle the world by our truth, our courage, and our devotion.

THE INDIAN KHILAFAT DELEGATION AT MANCHESTER.

Reasons why Turkey should remain a sovereign State were advanced at a public meeting in the Milton Hall, Manchester, on Friday night by the Indian Khilafat Delegation, which claims to speak for the 70,000,000 Mussulmans in the Indian Empire. The audience as a whole appeared to be sympathetic, although there were some hostile interruptions.

The chairman was Mr. B. G. Horniman, who was deported from India last year on account of his political activities. Mr. Horniman said that the 250, 000, 000 Hindus of India were absolutely at one with the Mussulmans on this question. The members of the delegation did not wish to set up Turkish domination over any people in the world. They were prepared to repudiate any massacres that might have been committed and to give guarantees to minorities against oppression. While so much had been heard about the alleged massacres committed by the Turks, the authorities in this country had deliberately withheld from the public information about massacres—which had undoubtedly taken place—of Mussulmans by Christians.

Mr. Mohamed Ali, the leader of the deputation, said that the interest of the Muslims had not been considered in the peace settlement, which was nevertheless of vital importance to them. The first religious obligation of a Mussulman was towards the

personal centre of the Islamic brotherhood, the Sultan of Turkey. As long as the world relied on force, the Khalifa could not dispense with temporal power and the irreducible minimum of temporal power which the Mussulmans considered necessary could be attained only by the restoration of the territorial *status quo ante bellum*. Allegations had been made about massacres in Armenia.

The speaker sympathised with Armenians, and he agreed that they should have a voice in their own government. To make allegations about Turkish massacres without inquiring into them was not just. The Mussulmans and the Hindus of India had demanded an open international inquiry into these allegations, and if it were proved that the Turks had dealt in murders and massacres the Turks should be punished. But the same law should be applied to Christians, Jews and Mussulmans. (Here, here.) Englishmen should not forget their own massacres at Amritsar.

Mr. Syud Hossain said that if the principle of self-determination or any other decent and rational principle were applied to the settlement of the Turkish question the result would be precisely what the delegation was demanding.

Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, a Hindu lady, supported the delegation in an impassioned speech, and said that her views represented those of all her co-religionists.—“Guardian.” May 3, 1920.

AT CAMBRIDGE.

"Islam is immortal; it cannot die!To carve up Turkey would be to carve our hearts." Such was the refrain running through all the speeches which followed the Cambridge Muslim Association's dinner on Saturday night.

The dinner, which was held at the Masonic Hall, was in honour of the Indian Khilafat Delegation, and for the first time several Muslim women were among the guests. The President of the Association, Mr. S. J. Imam, was in the chair; he was supported by the Khilafat Delegation—Mr. Mohamed Ali, Mr. Syud Hossain and Maulana Sulaimam Nadvi, with their secretary, Mr. Hayat. Among those also present were: Mr. H. I. Rahim (Vice-President of the Association), Dr. Hamid (Secretary), Prof. E. G. Browne (Professor of Arabic), Mrs. Sarojini Naidu, Miss Normanton (editor of "India"), Mr. Horniman (late editor of the "Bombay Chronicle," who was deported from India), Mr. G. G. Coulton (St. John's), Mr. J. C. Lawson (Pembroke), Mr. H. Rackham and Mr. Manning.

The toast of "The King, and Khalifat-ul-Muslimin" having been honoured, a member of the company sang the Muslim National Anthem. It might be roughly translated—

China is ours and India is ours ;

We are Mussulmans, and the whole world
is our home.

In our breast is the fire of the love of one
God,

Which it is not easy to destroy.

We cannot be vanquished by untruth—

O sky, you have tried us a hundred times
in this.

We have been reared under the shadow of
swords,

Therefore the dagger of the rising moon is
our emblem.

The valleys and the mountains of the West
resounded our call to prayers,

And none could withstand our onset.....

Once more out caravan marches forward !

Mr. Syud Hossain then proposed "Islam and Khilafat." The toast of "Islam and Khilafat," he said, "had a solemn almost a sombre, aspect to-day. Perhaps for that very reason it was the more worth while that the toast should be honoured in a gathering of Islam. (Applause.) It was a fact well worth bearing in mind that at all times in its memorable history Islam had attracted to itself friends of other nations ; in that very gathering they had friends of whom any community might well be proud. (Applause.) They had with them, for instance, Professor Browne, whose name was household word throughout Islam ; they had in Mrs. Naidu a distinguished representative of another great racial, religious and cultured denomination—the Hindus. (Applause.) And a community and a

creed which had always won the admiration and affection of some of the most discriminating among peoples might not be altogether undeserving of such allegiance, which had been given to it unsought and unasked.

The present hour witnessed a stage in the eventful history of Islam, to which history offered no parallel. The very fact that after 1,400 years a few Mussulmans found themselves 7,000 miles from their own homes for the defence of the Khilafat ought to give food for thought to Islam. The peoples who owned allegiance to the Islamic faith had been on the down grade for many decades: what used to be a name to conjure with for successive generations was to-day a by-word and a reproach. ("Shame!") Mussulmans had ceased to be true to those ideals and those conceptions which not so very long ago in the history of peoples were very remarkably and specially their own. The present deplorable situation was largely due to the fact that in a very essential sense the people of Islam were false to that faith and to those high ideals which made their forebears great. If they were to win back, to retrieve and redeem that awful cataclysm that had overtaken them, they must achieve a new orientation of themselves. They must remember that the stagnation and apathy, the want of hope, that characterised the Mussulman peoples of the world to-day did not form any essential consequence or result of anything that was

fundamental in the system of life that Islam postulated.

But the Mussulman peoples had strayed away from those fundamental principles ; and the time had come for all people who were proud (perhaps more proud now than ever before) to call themselves Mussulmans to give that problem the best thought and the best devotion of which they were capable. It needed something as utterly heart-rending as the present position of the Khilāfat to make Mussulmans all the world over call a halt and take serious stock of their destinies. It was a fact whose melancholy significance it was impossible to exaggerate, that for the first time in the history of Islam they were to-day face to face with the disintegration of the immortal institution of the Khilafat. But in their checkered history they had had crisis as grave and menacing as this one, and had tided them over ; and they would certainly tide the present crisis also. But the crisis would have been tided over in vain if it did not lead, not merely to a saving of the Khilafat, but to a saving of the souls of all Mussulmans. He thought that Islam stood on the threshold of a new destiny. Islam could not perish ; it was immortal. And they would most surely emerge from the present gloom—if for no other reason than that the deepest darkness preceded the dawn. An awakening would assuredly follow upon the present catastrophe, and Islam would become the torch-bearer of civilisation once

more. The unity and courage of Islam would be infinitely greater than its past, great as that had been. Let them work for the dawn of that day." (Applause.)

The Delegation.

"The Indian Khilafat Delegation" was proposed by the President. "The Delegation," he remarked, "did not look the ferocious beasts, the yellow-fanged monsters, that their critics would have them supposed to be. The Delegation had come to England on a purely religious mission, and had nothing to do with politics at all—the people who said that the Delegation was a political move were doing them the greatest possible insult. Would they allow persecution to compromise their faith? No: they would face death first." (Applause.)

Mr. Mohamed Ali responded. After lamenting that in this country they very seldom saw the sun and hardly ever the moon, he said:—"If they had had any self-respect they would not have come to England; if the Islamic peoples had understood what Islam stood for there would have been no need to ask anybody to protect their faith. England had pledged that Mussulmans should have freedom of faith; and though the Delegation had not come to hold out any threats, it was essential that they should give a friendly and serious warning of the consequences in the East which would follow the breaking of that pledge. For the question of the dismember-

ment of the Khilafat went to the very roots of Islam.

"Islam stood for a faith, for a complete scheme of life. To-day they came back to the Divine mission with which they were charged. The Mussulman peoples were not asking England for any territory ; they were only asking for elbow-room. It was far better that they should perish still as masters of their souls and captains of their consciences than that they should live in humiliation. If it came to the shedding of blood, the blood would not be on their head. "To carve up Turkey would be to carve our hearts." Their destiny was to preach to the world the unity of God, true culture and true ethics ; they went, not with a sword in their hand, but with the Koran. Hitherto Islam had sought power, and had lost it ; the moment it gave up the quest for power, then would power come to them. They appealed to England to allow the freedom of the Mussulman conscience ; to carve Turkey would be to destroy that freedom. It lay in England's hands whether the Mussulmans should live as human beings or as slaves." (Applause.)

Responding to the toast of "The Other Guest" (proposed by the Vice-President), Mrs. Naidu said : "The Hindus of India would stand by Islam to the death—they had no separate destiny. They believed that Islam was the religion of humanity, the religion of democracy ; and because Islam was the most democratic of religions it would endure. Islam could not die. Generations of Mussulmans had

been faithless to it, generations had betrayed their heritage ; yet Islam endured unchanging because it was one manifestation of the abiding truth. Islam had the highest human code of ethics that the world had ever seen, and if they stood by the faith it would triumph gloriously." (Applause.)—"Cambridge Daily News," May 3, 1920.

KHILAFAT DELEGATION.

BOMBAY'S WELCOME.

Under the auspices of the Bombay National Union and the Bombay Branch of the Indian Home Rule League, a public meeting was held at Shantaram's Chawl, Bombay, on October 5, 1921, to accord a hearty reception to Mawlana Mahomed Ali and other members of the Khilafat Deputation. Mr. Joseph Baptista presided, and there was a large attendance. Mawlana Mahomed Ali and his colleagues of the Deputation were on arrival received with loud cheering.

Mr. Baptista, opening the proceedings, paid a glowing tribute to the members of the Deputation and particularly to its chief Mawlana Mahomed Ali for the work done by them in Europe. He added the queries put by Mawlana Mahomed Ali to the statesmen of Europe, "whether this war was meant to make the world safe for democracy or hypocrisy" and "whether the war to end war was to be succeeded by a peace to end all peace on earth" would ring through the world so long as the wrongs of Islam

were not redressed and the rights of India were not granted, namely, Swarajya as an integral part of the British Empire.

Mawlana Mahomed Ali, on rising to address the assembly, received an ovation. He spoke for about an hour and in the course of his speech he recounted what the Deputation had done in Europe. He asked if it was not a shame that the only one Power which spoke out against the Turkish Treaty should have been other than England who had seven crores of Musalmans as her subjects? It was Italy that supported Turkey at the Peace Conference while M. Millerand was won over to his side by Mr. Lloyd George. Continuing, Mawlana Mahomed Ali said that when the Deputation reached England, everybody, whether it was one who sympathised with them or another who was opposed to them, advised them not to threaten England. In reply he told them he did not at all want to use threats. Mr. Fisher, who was at one time his tutor at Cambridge, also told him not to hold out threats. He repeated to Mr. Fisher what he had told others that India did not want to threaten England but that India did want to warn England and he asked him to choose for him words which would convey the warning without its being a threat and the Deputation would sign the warning. But he asked Mr. Fisher and others to let it be a serious warning that unless her wrongs were redressed India would not rest and would not let England have rest. India did not want blood-

shed or mischief or a disturbance of the peace or tranquillity of the country, because if the peace and tranquillity were gone it was not Mr. Lloyd George but the people of India who would have to suffer. He told his English friends that the Indians were not too proud to receive genuine sympathy and help but that whether they assisted the Indians or not, the latter meant to assist themselves. In regard to Non-Co-operation, he said that for himself he would go his way without looking to the right or left to see whether Mr. Jinnah, or Mr. Baptista was following him or not. He would walk along that path even if he had to walk alone.

ACCOUNT OF WORK IN EUROPE.

SERIOUS DIFFICULTIES OF THE DELEGATION.

To welcome Mawlana Mahomed Ali and his colleagues on the Indian Khilafat Delegation who arrived in Bombay on Monday, a public meeting was held that night at the Mastan Shah's Tank. Mahatma Gandhi was voted to the chair in the absence of Mr. Chotani who was indisposed. There was a large audience of Hindus and Mahomedans, numbering about 15,000.

Prominent among those present were Messrs. Marmaduke Pickthal, Shaukat Ali, S. G. Banker, Ahmed Haji Siddick Khatri, V. J. Jarajani, Abbas Tyabji, Syed Gulum Mahomed Refai, Khan Bahadur Mahomed Ali Abdul Kader, Shrimati Sarala Devi

Chaudhurani and Mrs. Anusuyabai Sarabai and many others.

MAHATMA GANDHI'S TRIBUTE.

The proceedings began with the recitation of a hymn from the Qur'an. Afterwards the Chairman, addressing the audience, said that he was sorry Mr. Chhotani could not take part in the meeting but he hoped Mr. Chhotani would soon get better and begin the work of the Khilafat Committee in the same right earnest as before. Continuing he said that that was a very happy day for him and them all as their brother Mahomed Ali and his colleagues, after arduous work in connection with the Khilafat question, returned to their Motherland safe and sound.

He could not express what affection he harboured towards Mawlana Mahomed Ali. Since he had met the Ali brothers in Delhi in the year 1915 and later in Aligarh, he was much impressed, and thought that one day the two brothers would be among the Mahomedans what Mr. Gokhale was among the Hindus, and he was glad that what he had then surmised, has come true now.

Mahatma Gandhi then requested Mawlana Mahomed Ali to lay, before the audience, the account of his work in Europe, in connection with the Khilafat question.

MAWLANA MAHOMED ALI'S REPLY.

Mawlana Mahomed Ali, who was given a deafening ovation when he rose, said that it was after

eight months that he met his brethren of the same faith, and his countrymen, the absence of whose association he felt more and more the further he went. He regretted not finding Mr. Chhotani present there but he hoped Mr. Chhotani would soon get better and shoulder the Khilafat work as vigorously as before.

He then referred to the lamentable demise of Lokmanya Tilak whose death, he said, was an irreparable loss to the country, specially at this juncture. The lessons Mr. Tilak had been teaching for 40 years were now to be revised by the nation. Mr. Tilak taught his countrymen to think independently, to talk fearlessly and to avoid those who adopted flattery as their avocation.

Continuing Mawlana Mahomed Ali said the Indian Khilafat Deputation, went to Europe to represent the feelings of the Indian Mahomedans at the unjust Turkish Peace Treaty. Before the Deputation reached England the British Cabinet—what to speak of the masses!—knew nothing about the grievances of the Indian Mahomedans and their Hindu brethren. The only information they used to get about India, was about some murders of Indians by Europeans or of some Europeans by Indians, The London *Times*, the *Daily Telegraph* and such other reactionary journals were publishing, in their columns, all that was happening in any corner of the world except the sufferings and grievances of the Muslims and Indians. He knew what was the condition in

Thrace and Smyrna, though they in India were debarred from knowing it on account of the censorship.

His deputation represented the Moslem cause before the European public in as best a way as was possible for them. They were very often questioned if Smyrna and Thrace were returned to the Turks, would the Mahomedans be content and the agitation be stopped? But their emphatic reply was "either Hijrat or Jihad." They did not leave a single point unrepresented and even Mr. Lloyd George said that the Deputation had done their best to adequately convince Europe as to what the Indian Mahomedans wanted. The Deputation clearly explained to the European nations the Indians did not want to knock out anything by threat. They were even ready to live like slaves if it were ordained by God.

Proceeding, Mawlana Mahomed Ali said his Deputation explained in clear terms that the Mahomedan cared for the Khilafat as much as a woman cared for her honour. They also explained that even the entire Hindu community were deeply sympathising with their cause, because it was a just one. The Deputation had plainly told Mr. Montagu that if Britons wanted to crush the Turks inspite of their responsible pledges they would experience only unrest and consternation instead of a peaceful reconstruction of the world after the war. Of course, they (Indian Mahomedans) did not want violence. Their very Jihad question meant non-violence.

Mawlana Mahomed Ali then with tears in his

eyes narrated an incident that before he met with in Rome where he met six Tracian Moslems in terrible distress who asked him as to what the seven crores of Indian Mahomedans were doing for them. This drew tears from many eyes in the audience.

In conclusion Mawlana Mahomed Ali explained how the mean partial, and unjust attitude of the English press maimed their activities. He said the Press refused even to accept advertisements on payment from the Deputation, while, on contrary, they were filling their columns with the details of activities of their enemies.

His speech ended with an appeal for the preservation and development of the Hindu-Moslem entente.

Mawlana Mahomed Ali was followed by Maulana Suleman Nadvi, Mr. Abul Kasem and Maulvi Abdul Majid whose speeches were heard by the audience with keen interest and deep silence.

The proceedings terminated with a vote of thanks to the chair, proposed by Mawlana Shaukat Ali.

INDIAN MUSLIM DELEGATION IN EUROPE.

INDIAN MUSLIM DELEGATION INTERVIEWED.

The Indian Muslim Delegation which has come to this country on the special invitation of the British Government, has been asked to put the views of the Indian Muslims before the authorities on the ques-

tion of Turkish Empire settlement. In its composition the Delegation represent some of the best minds of India. It is led by His Highness the Agha Khan, and the President of All-India Central Khilafat Committee, Haji Mian Mohammad Chotani, the well-known merchant prince of Bombay who is leading the Khilafat movement in India. He is ably supported by Mr. Syed Hasan Imam (an ex-judge of Calcutta and Patna High Courts and one of the most brilliant lawyers in India), Dr. Mukhtar Ahmad Ansari (General Secretary of the Central Khilafat Committee, an ex-President of the All India Muslim League, and one of the most eminent spokesmen of awakened Islam in the East) and Shaikh Mushir Husain Kidwai (General Secretary of the Central Islamic Society, well-known author of many works on Islamic Sociology and a devoted worker in the cause of Islam), and Qazi Abdul Ghaffar (Editor of the *Jamhur*).

Mr. Chotani declared to our representative "that the whole mass of Indian people, consisting of Muslims, Hindus, Conservatives, Moderates, and Nationalists, were united on the Turkish question and its bearing on Khilafat and other matters. Members of the Indian Muslim Delegation proceeding to London, although belonging to different schools of thought, were unanimous in their demands on this question. Their demands are :—(1) Full independence and sovereign rights of the Turks over Turkish Turkey, which undoubtedly includes Smyrna and Thrace with complete economic, political, military

and naval freedom. (2) No non-Moslem control of any kind, direct or indirect, over the Arab-speaking parts of the Turkish Empire which comprise the sacred lands and the Holy Places of Islam. (3) Indians who are themselves struggling for their own freedom were not opposed to national autonomy in non-Turkish part, but they insist that the religious suzerainty of the Khalif-Sultan should be maintained.

"Indians who did not spare their blood or treasure to help France in her most critical situation expect full sympathy and support from her in their just claims."

These statements, despite their extreme brevity, explain comprehensively the standpoint of Indian Muslims on the unsolved problem of Turkish settlement. They set out those general principles which were formulated just after the Armistice to be the irreducible minimum of their demands to which Musalmans thought that they were entitled on account both of the expressions of solemn pledges given to them by the Allied statesmen, and the sacred principles of their faith by which their loyalty to the British connection was conditioned.—"The Louvre"—Paris, March, 1921.

PART III.

THE KHILAFAT AND THE TURKISH TREATY

TURKISH PEACE TREATY.*

UNJUST AND OUTRAGEOUS TERMS.

A *Gazette of India Extraordinary* issued from Simla on the 14th May, 1920, published the following principal conditions of the peace terms, which have been communicated by the Allies to Turkey :—

(1) The frontiers of Turkey will be as already demarcated, and where necessary revised by a Boundary Commission to be created. According to this delimitation Turkey will include the Constantinople sector of Thrace and all the predominantly Turkish areas of Asia Minor.

(2) The rights and titles of the Turkish Government in Constantinople will not be affected, but the right to modify this provision is reserved in the event of the failure of Turkey faithfully to fulfil the treaty.

(3) A Commission of the Straits will have authority over all waters between the Mediterranean mouth of the Dardanelles, the Black Sea mouth of the Bosphorous, and of the waters within three miles of

* For full text of the Turkish Treaty and its sinister features etc. see "INDIA AND TURKISH TREATY."

each of these mouths ; also on the shores to such extent as may be necessary. The duty of the Commission will be to ensure freedom of navigation in these waters in peace and war.

(4) A scheme of local self-government will be drafted for Kurdistan, including provision for the protection of the Assyro-Chaldeans and other minorities. The League of Nations will decide later whether Kurdistan should be granted independence of Turkey, if it be proved that separation is desired by the majority of the Kurdish people.

(5) Certain portions of Smyrna are formed into a separate unit to be administered by Greece, the suzerainty of Turkey being continued for a period of years till the autonomous State of Smyrna decides its own destiny.

(6) With the exception of the Constantinople sector, Eastern Thrace is ceded to Greece, provision being made for the local self-government of the town of Adrianople.

(7) Certain portions of the Armenian districts of Turkey are added to the existing Armenian Republic, the boundary between Turkey and Armenia in certain districts being referred to the arbitration of the President of the United States, whose decision will be final thereon and on any stipulation regarding the Armenian access to the sea.

(8) Syria, Mesopotamia and Palestine are provisionally recognised as independent States, subject to administrative advice and assistance from a Manda-

tory Power until such time as they are able to stand alone. The mandate for Syria has been entrusted to France and those for Mesopotamia and Palestine to Britain. The mandate for Palestine will include the provision for giving effect to the declaration of November 8, 1918, regarding the establishment of a national home for the Jewish people.

(9) The Hedjaz is recognized as a free and independent State. The King of the Hedjaz undertakes to assure free and easy access to Mecca and Medina to Muslim pilgrims of all countries.

(10) Turkey relinquishes all rights and titles over Egypt and the Sudan and Cyprus.

(11) Turkey recognises the French protectorate over Morocco and Tunis.

(12) Turkey relinquishes her claims to certain islands in the Aegean.

(13) The military, naval, and air forces at the disposal of Turkey will consist of the following:—

(1) The Sultan's bodyguard at Constantinople; (2) a troop of gendarmerie for the maintenance of international order and security and the protection of minorities; (3) special elements for reinforcement of the gendarmerie and eventual control of the frontiers. The bodyguard is limited to 700 and the gendarmarie with special elements to 50,000. All warships interned in Turkish ports are declared to be finally surrendered. The Turkish fleet is limited to six torpedo boats and seven sloops.

No military or naval air forces or dirigibles are to be maintained.

(14) Control will be maintained over the finances of Turkey until the discharge of her international obligations has been assured.

(15) Freedom of navigation and transit is secured.

The following ports are declared international ports provision to be made for free zones in each :— Alexandretta, Busrah, Constantinople, Dedeagatch, Haief, Hailad Pasha, Smyrna and Trebizond.

(16) In addition to the above are numerous provisions regarding, (a) League of Nations, (b) protection of minorities, (c) restoration of abandoned property rights, (d) prisoner of war, (e) graves of Allied soldiers, (f) punishment of war criminals, (g) economic question and concessions, (h) labour conventions and (i) antiquities. But it is not necessary to detail these in the present statement.

VICEROY'S MESSAGE TO MUSLIMS.

FUTILE EFFORTS TO CONSOLE THEM.

A *Gazette of India Extraordinary* (May 14, 1920) publishes the following message from His Excellency the Viceroy (Lord Chelmsford) to the Muslim people of India :—

'The decision of the Supreme Council of the Allies in respect of the peace settlement with Turkey

have been made known to the world. They have been reached after the most careful and anxious consideration of representations from the Muslims of all countries, and you have my assurance that before coming to its present decision the Supreme Council has had all possible regard to those representations which have proceeded from the Mahomedan subjects of His Majesty in India. My Government are issuing along with a summary of the peace terms a statement which explains the principal decisions and the reasons for them. These decisions are in full accordance with the high principles which have been applied in the peace settlement with all other Powers lately at war with Britain and her Allies. Nevertheless they include terms which I fear must be painful to all Muslims. The long delays which have protracted your anxiety for over a year although they have been unavoidable, have filled me with regret for your sakes, and now in your hour of trial I desire to send you a message of encouragement and sympathy which I trust will uphold you. In the day of the Empire's need you made a splendid response to the call of your King and country, and by so doing you contributed much to the triumph of those ideals of justice and humanity for which the Allies fought. The Empire of which you form a part is now firmly established on these ideals and a great future of political progress and material prosperity is within the grasp of the Muslims of India, who have ever enjoyed under British rule the fullest religious free-

dom. Before the late disastrous war Great Britain had always maintained the closest ties of friendship with Turkey and I am confident that with the conclusion to this new treaty that friendship will quickly take life again and a Turkey regenerate, full of hope and strength, will stand forth in the future as in the past a pillar of the Islamic faith. This thought will, I trust, strengthen you to accept the peace terms with resignation, courage and fortitude, and to keep your loyalty towards the Crown bright and untarnished as it has been so many generations."

"God save the King-Emperor"

(Sd.) CHELMSFORD.

MUSLIM REPRESENTATION.

In pursuance of the decision arrived at the special meeting of the Central Khilfaat Committee held at Allahabad in regard to the non-co-operation movement the following letter signed by about ninety Sunni Mussalmans from various parts of India including Messrs. Yaqub Hasan, Maz-har-ul-Huq, Maulana Abdul Bari, Maulana Hasrat Mohani, Dr. Kitchlew, Haji Miyan Mahomed Chhotani and Maulana Shaukat Ali, was sent to the Viceroy from Bombay on Tuesday, the 22nd June (1920):—

YOUR EXCELLENCY,

We the undersigned claim to represent the largest body of Sunni Muslim opinion. We have

most carefully read the Turkish peace terms and we consider them to be in direct violation of the religious sentiments of Mussalmans. They violate obligations imposed upon the Sunnis and wound the susceptibilities of all Mussalmans. They are contrary to pledges of British Ministers on the strength of which it has been admitted it was possible to draw upon India for Muslim recruits during the war. We hold that the British Empire, which is the greatest Mahomedan Power in the world, cannot treat the Turkish Empire which represents the Khilafat in the same manner that it may treat a defeated enemy. Indeed we contend that in certain respects Turkey has been treated worse than other Powers. We respectfully submit that in the treatment of Turkey the British Government are bound to respect Indian Muslim sentiment in so far as it is neither unjust nor unreasonable. In our opinion the position taken up by the Indian Mussalmans is simple. They cannot bear the thought of the temporal power of the Sultan being adversely affected by way of punishment for his having joined Germany under circumstances which need not be examined here, but we have no desire to ask for anything that would interfere with the principle of self-determination. We have no desire to uphold any misrule such as has been attributed to Turkey. Our delegates in Europe have asked for an independent commission of enquiry to investigate the charge of wanton cruelty said to have been practised by Turkish soldiers in Armenia. We

cannot look with indifference upon the partition of Turkey and her empire for the sake of punishment for humiliating her. We would, therefore, request Your Excellency and your Government to ask His Majesty's Ministers to secure a revision of the peace terms and to tell them that on their failure to do so Your Excellency will make common cause with the people of India. We make this suggestion as Your Excellency has repeatedly declared that Your Government has consistently and often pressed upon the attention of His Majesty's Ministers the case of Indian Mussalmans in this matter of vital concern to the vast majority of them. We feel, therefore, that we have a right to ask Your Excellency to reassure the Mussalmans of India that they still retain your active co-operation and powerful advocacy in the prosecution of their claims, even to the point of resignation of your high office should His Majesty's Ministers fail to secure a revision of the terms consistently with the pledges and sentiment mentioned above. We venture respectfully to suggest that had India been a Dominion enjoying full self-government her responsible Ministers would have as a matter of course resigned as a protest against such a serious breach of pledges and flouting of religious opinion as are involved in the peace terms. If unfortunately Your Excellency will not adopt our humble suggestion we shall be obliged as from the 1st of August next to withdraw co-operation from the Government and ask our co-religionists and Hindu brethren to do

likewise. We ask Your Excellency not to regard our statement as a threat or in any way as a mark of disrespect. We claim to be as loyal subjects of the Crown as any in India, but we consider our loyalty to an earthly sovereign to be subservient to our loyalty to Islam. The latter enjoins upon every Mussalman to consider those who wantonly injure the status of the Khalifa to be enemies of Islam and to resist them. We recognise that even if we had the power we must not resort to arms so long as any other measure are at our disposal. We feel that the least a Mussalman can do in these circumstances is not to assist those who are guilty of trying to reduce the Khilafat practically to nothingness. It would, therefore, become our painful duty to refuse to co-operate with the Government which accepts the peace terms and advises acceptance thereof by us. We shall hope that such a serious step as non-co-operation will not become necessary, but should it unfortunately happen to be otherwise we assure Your Excellency that we shall strive our utmost to avoid violence. We fully recognise our responsibility. We know that any eruption of violence must check and injure the peaceful demonstration contemplated by us, and what is more the sacred cause which is dear to us as life. We shall, therefore, take up non-co-operation in progressive stages so as to cause the least necessary dislocation or embarrassment to the Government and so as to enable us to control and discipline popular feeling.

THE SIGNATURES TO THE DOCUMENT.

A Press *communiqué* from Simla (June 25) states : Mr. Gandhi's letter and the Muham-madan representation to His Excellency the Viceroy which were published in Bombay last evening were received in Simla to-day with the following letter from Mr. Gandhi :—"I enclose herewith a representation signed by Mussulman representatives and another by me for submission to His Excellency. The Mussalman representation does not bear original signatures as it was circulated in the different parts of India and some of the signatures authorised by wires. Some of the signatures are on soiled paper but the authority in every case is in the possession of the Central Khilafat Committee. I do not wish to say anything about the representations but shall only express the hope that they will receive due weight from His Excellency. I purpose to hand the copies to the press on Thursday evening."

PART IV.

VIEWS OF NON-MOSLEMS ON KHILAFAT

MAHATMA GANDHI ON KHILAFAT.

WHY I HAVE JOINED THE MOVEMENT.

It is just my sense of moral responsibilities which has made me take up the Khilafat question and to identify myself entirely with the Mahomedans. It is perfectly true that I am assisting and countenancing the union between the Hindus and Muslims, but certainly not with "a view of embarrassing England and the Allied Powers in the matter of the dismemberment of the Ottoman Empire," it is contrary to my creed to embarrass governments or anybody else. This does not however mean that certain acts of mine may not result in embarrassment. But I should not hold myself responsible for having caused embarrassment when I resist the wrong of a wrong-doer by refusing assistance in his wrong-doing. On the Khilafat question I refuse to be party to a broken pledge. Mr. Lloyd George's solemn declaration is practically the whole of the case for Indian Mahomedans and when that case is fortified by scriptural authority it becomes unanswerable. Moreover, it is incorrect to say that I have "allied myself to one of the prevailing

anarchies" or that I "have wrongly countenanced the movement to place the cruel and unjust despotism of the Stamboul Government above the interests of humanity." In the whole of the Mahomedan demand there is no insistence on the retention of the so-called unjust despotism of the Stamboul Government; on the contrary the Mahomedans have accepted the principle of taking full guarantees from that Government for the protection of non-Muslim minorities. I do not know how far the condition of Armenia and Syria may be considered an 'anarchy,' and how far the Turkish Government may be held responsible for it. I much suspect that the reports from these quarters are much exaggerated and that the European powers are themselves in a measure responsible for what misrule there may be in Armenia and Syria. But I am in no way interested in supporting Turkish or any other anarchy. The Allied Powers can easily prevent it by means other than that of ending Turkish rule or dismembering and weakening the Ottoman Empire. The Allied Powers are not dealing with a new situation. If Turkey was to be partitioned, the position should have been made clear at the commencement of the war. There would then have been no question of a broken pledge. As it is, no Indian Mahomedan has any regard for the promises of British Ministers. In his opinion, the cry against Turkey is that of Christianity *vs.* Islam with England as the leader in the cry. The latest cablegram from Mr. Mahomed

Ali strengthens the impression, for he says that unlike as in England his deputation is receiving much support from the French Government and the people.

Thus, if it is true, as I hold it is true that the Indian Mussalmans have a cause that is just and is supported by scriptural authority, then for the Hindus not to support them to the utmost would be a cowardly breach of brotherhood and they would forfeit all claim to consideration from their Mahomedan countrymen. As a public-server therefore, I would be unworthy of the position I claim, if I did not support Indian Mussalmans in their struggle to maintain the Khilafat in accordance with their religious belief. I believe that in supporting them I am rendering a service to the Empire, because by assisting my Mahomedan countrymen to give a disciplined expression to their sentiment it becomes possible to make the agitation thoroughly, orderly and even successful.

THE TURKISH TREATY.

We have given above the terms of the Turkish treaty as indicated in Reuter's messages. These reports are incomplete and all of them are not equally authenticated. But if these terms are true, they are challenge to the Muslim demands. Turkish Sovereignty is confined to the Chatalja lines. This means that the Big three of the Supreme Council

have cut off Thrace from Turkish dominions. This is a distinct breach of the pledge given by one of these Three, viz., the Premier of the British Empire. To remain within the Chatalja lines and, we are afraid, as a dependant of the Allies, is for the Sultan a humiliating position inconsistent with the Koranic injunctions. Such a restricted position of the Turks is virtually a success of the bag and baggage school.

When we come to the question of mandates, the Allied Powers' motives come out more distinctly. The Arabs' claim of independence was used as a difficulty against keeping Turkish Sovereignty. This was defended in the name of self-determination and by pointing out parallels of Transylvania and other provinces. When the final movement came, the Allies have ventured to divide the spoils amongst themselves. Britain is given the mandate over Mesopotamia, and Palestine and France has the mandate over Syria. The Arab delegation complains in their note lately issued expressing their disappointment at the Supreme Council's decision with regard to the Arab liberated countries, which, it declares, is contrary to the principle of self-determination.

So what little news has arrived about the Turkish treaty, is uniformly disquieting. The Moslems have found sufficient ground to honour Russia more than the Allies. Russia has recognised the freedom of Khiva and Bokhara. The Moslem world, as H. M. the Amir of Afghanistan said in his speech, will feel

grateful towards Russia inspite of all the rumours abroad about its anarchy and disorder, whereas the whole Moslem world will resent the action of the other European nations who have allied with each other to carry out a joint coercion and extinction of Turkey in the name of self-determination and partly in the guise of the interest of civilization.

The terms of the Turkish treaty are not only a breach of the Premier's pledge, not only a sin against the principle of self-determination, but they also show a reckless indifference of the Allied Powers towards the Koranic injunctions. The terms point out that Mr. Lloyd George's misinformed ideas of Khilafat have prevailed in the Council. Like Mr. Lloyd George other statesmen also at San Remo have compared Caliphate with Popedom and ignored the Koranic ideas of associating spiritual power with temporal power. These misguided statesmen were too much possessed by haughtiness and so they refused to receive any enlightenment on the question of Khilafat from the Deputation. They could have corrected themselves had they heard Mr. Mahomed Ali on this point. Speaking at the Essex Hall meeting Mr. Mahomed Ali distinguished between Popedom and Caliphate and clearly explained what Caliphate means. (See pp. 173-174 of this book).

These few words could have removed the misundertakings rooted in the minds of those that met at San Remo, if they were in earnest for a just solution. But Mr. Mahomed Ali's deputation was

not given any hearing by the Peace Conference. They were told that the Peace Conference had already heard the official delegation of India on this question. But the wrong notions the Allies still entertain about Caliphate are a sufficient indication of the effects of the work of this official delegation. The result of these wrong notions is the present settlement and this unjust settlement will unsettle the world. They know not what they do.

TURKISH PEACE TERMS.

The question of question to-day is the Khilafat question, otherwise known as that of the Turkish peace terms. His Excellency the Viceroy deserves our thanks for receiving the joint deputation even at this late hour, especially when he was busy preparing to receive the head of the different provinces. His Excellency must be thanked for the unfailing courtesy with which he received the deputation and the courteous language in which his reply was couched. But mere courtesy, valuable as it is at all times, never so valuable as at this, is not enough at this critical moment. 'Sweet words butter no parsnips' is a proverb more applicable to-day than ever before. Behind the courtesy there was the determination to punish Turkey. Punishment of Turkey is a thing which Muslim sentiment cannot tolerate for a moment. Muslim soldiers are as responsible for the result of the war as any others.

It was to appease them that Mr. Asquith said when Turkey decided to join the Central Powers that the British Government had no designs on Turkey and that His Majesty's Government would never think of punishing the Sultan for the misdeeds of the Turkish Committee. Examined by that standard the Viceregal reply is not only disappointing but it is a fall from truth and justice.

What is this British Empire? It is as much Mahomedan and Hindu as it is Christian. Its religious neutrality is not a virtue, or if it is, it is a virtue of necessity. Such a mighty Empire could not be held together on any other terms. British ministers are therefore bound to protect Mahomedan interests as any other. Indeed as the Muslim rejoinder says, they are bound to make the cause their own. What is the use of His Excellency having presented the Muslim claim before the Conference? If the cause is lost the Mahomedans will be entitled to think that Britain did not do her duty by them. And the Viceregal reply confirms the view. When His Excellency says that Turkey must suffer for her having joined the Central Powers he but expresses the opinion of British ministers. We hope, therefore, with the framers of the Muslim rejoinder that His Majesty's ministers will mend the mistakes if any have been committed and secure a settlement that would satisfy Mahomedan sentiment.

What does the sentiment demand? The preservation of the Khilafat with such guarantees as

may be necessary for the protection of the interests of the non-Muslim races living under Turkish rule and the Khalif's control over Arabia and the Holy Places with such arrangement as may be required for guaranteeing Arab self-rule, should the Arabs desire it. It is hardly possible to state the claim more fairly than has been done. It is a claim backed by justice, by the declarations of British ministers and by the unanimous Hindu and Muslim opinion. It would be midsummer madness to reject or whittle down a claim so backed.

FURTHER QUESTIONS ANSWERED.

I have been overwhelmed with public criticism and private advice and even anonymous letters telling me exactly what I should do. Some are impatient that I do not advise immediate and extensive non-co-operation ; others tell me what harm I am doing the country by throwing it knowingly in a tempest of violence on either side. It is difficult for me to deal with the whole of the criticism, but I would summarise some of the objections and endeavour to answer them to the best of my ability. These are in addition to those I have already answered :—

(1) Turkish claim is immoral or unjust and how can I, a lover of truth and justice, support it?

(2) Even if the claim be just in theory, the Turk is hopelessly incapable, weak and cruel. He does not deserve any assistance.

(3) Even if Turkey deserves all that is claimed for her, why should I land India in an international struggle?

(4) It is no part of the Indian Mahomedans' business to meddle in this affair. If they cherish any political ambition, they have tried, they have failed and they should now sit still. If it is a religious matter with them, it cannot appeal to the Hindu reason in the manner it is put and in any case Hindus ought not to identify themselves with Mahomedans in their religious quarrel with Christendom.

I shall now answer the objections in the order in which they are stated—

(1) In my opinion the Turkish claim is not only not immoral and unjust, but it is highly equitable, if only because Turkey wants to retain what is her own. And the Mahomedan manifesto has definitely declared that whatever guarantees may be necessary to be taken for the protection of non-Muslim and non-Turkish races, should be taken so as to give the Christians theirs and the Arabs their self-government under the Turkish suzerainty.

(2) I do not believe the Turk to be weak, incapable or cruel. He is certainly disorganised and probably without good generalship. He has been obliged to fight against heavy odds. The argument of weakness, incapacity and cruelty one often hears quoted in connection with those from whom power is sought to be taken away. About the alleged massacres a proper commission has been asked for,

but never granted. And in any case security can be taken against oppression.

(3) I have already stated that if I were not interested in the Indian Mahomedans, I would not interest myself in the welfare of the Turks any more than I am in that of the Austrians or the Poles. But I am bound as an Indian to share the sufferings and trials of fellow-Indians, if I deem the Mahomedan to be my brother. It is my duty to help him in his hour of peril to the best of my ability, if his cause commends itself to me as just.

(4) The fourth refers to the extent Hindus should join hands with the Mahomedans. It is therefore a matter of feeling and opinion. It is expedient to suffer for my Mahomedan brother to the utmost in a just cause and I should therefore travel with him along the whole road so long as the means employed by him are as honourable as his end. I cannot regulate the Mahomedan feeling. I must accept his statement that the Khilafat is with him a religious question in the sense that it binds him to reach the goal even at the cost of his own life.

MR. CANDLER'S OPEN LETTER.

Mr. Candler has favoured me with an open letter on this question of questions. The letter has already appeared in the Press. I can appreciate Mr. Candler's position as I would like him and other Englishmen to appreciate mine and that of hundreds

of Hindus who feel as I do. Mr. Candler's letter is an attempt to show that Mr. Lloyd George's pledge is not in any way broken by the peace terms. I quite agree with him that Mr. Lloyd George's words ought not to be torn from their context to support the Mahomedan claim. These are Mr. Lloyd George's words as quoted in the recent Viceregal message: "Nor are we fighting to destroy Austria-Hungary or to deprive Turkey of its capital, or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish in race." Mr. Candler seems to read 'which' as if it meant 'if they,' whereas I give the pronoun its natural meaning, namely, that the Prime Minister knew in 1918, that the lands referred to by him were 'predominantly Turkish in race.' And if this is the meaning, I venture to suggest that the pledge has been broken in a most barefaced manner, for there is practically nothing left to the Turk of 'the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace.'

I have already given my view of the retention of the Sultan in Constantinople. It is an insult to the intelligence of man to suggest that 'the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the home-land of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople' has been left unimpaired by the terms of peace. This is the other passage from the speech which I presume Mr. Candler wants me to read together with the one already quoted:—

"While we do not challenge the maintenance of

the Turkish Empire in the home-land of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople, the passage between the Mediterranean and the Black Sea being inter-nationalised, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine are in our judgment entitled to a recognition of their separate national condition."

Did that mean entire removal of Turkish influence, extinction of Turkish suzerainty and the introduction of European-Christian influence under the guise of Mandates? Have the Moslems of Arabia, Armenia, Mesopotamia, Syria and Palestine been committed, or is the new arrangement being superimposed upon them by Powers conscious of their own own brute-strength rather than of justice of their action? I for one would nurse by every legitimate means the spirit of independence in the brave Arabs, but I shudder to think what will happen to them under the schemes of exploitation of their country by the greedy capitalists protected as they will be by the mandatory Powers. If the pledge is to be fulfilled, let these places have full self-government with suzerainty to be retained with Turkey as has been suggested by the *Times of India*. Let there be all the necessary guarantees taken from Turkey about the internal independence of the Arabs. But to remove that suzerainty, to deprive the Khalif of the wardenship of the Holy Places is to render Khilafat a mockery which no Mahomedan can possibly look upon with equanimity. I am not alone in my interpretation of the pledge. The Right

Hon'ble Ameer Ali calls the peace terms a breach of faith. Mr. Charles Roberts reminds the British public that the Indian Mussalman sentiment regarding the Turkish Treaty is based upon the Prime Minister's pledge regarding Thrace, Constantinople and Turkish lands in Asia Minor, repeated on February 26 last with deliberation by Mr. Llyod George. Mr. Roberts holds that the pledge must be treated as a whole, not as binding only regarding Constantinople but also binding as regards Thrace and Asia Minor. He describes the pledge as binding upon the nation as a whole and its breach in any part as a gross breach of faith on the part of the British Empire. He demands that if there is an unanswerable reply to the charge of breach of faith it ought to be given and adds the Prime Minister may regard his own word lightly if he chooses, but he has no right to break a pledge given on behalf of the nation. He concludes that it is incredible that such pledge should not have been kept in the letter and in the spirit. He adds: "I have reason to believe that these views are fully shared by prominent members of the Cabinet."

I wonder if Mr. Candler knows what is going on to-day in England. Mr. Pickthall writing in *New Age* says: "No impartial international enquiry into the whole question of the Armenian massacres has been instituted in the ample time which has elapsed since the conclusion of armistice with Turkey. The Turkish Government has asked for

such enquiry. But the Armenian organisations and the Armenian partisans refuse to hear of such a thing, declaring that the Bryce and Lepssens reports are quite sufficient to condemn the Turks. In other words the judgment should be given on the case for prosecution alone. The inter-allied commission which investigated the unfortunate events in Smyrna last year, made a report unfavourable to Greek claims. Therefore, that report has not been published here in England, though in other countries it has long been public property." He then goes on to show how money is being scattered by Armenian and Greek emissaries in order to popularise their cause and adds: "This conjunction of dense ignorance and cunning falsehood is fraught with instant danger to the British realm," and concludes: "A Government and people which prefer propaganda to fact as the ground of policy—and foreign policy at that—is self-condemned."

I have reproduced the above extract in order to show that the present British policy has been affected by propaganda of an unscrupulous nature. Turkey which was dominant over two million square miles of Asia, Africa and Europe in the 17th century, under the terms of the treaty, says the *London Chronicle*, has dwindled down to little more than 1,000 square miles. It says, "All European Turkey could now be accommodated comfortably between the Landsend and the Tamar, Cornwall alone exceeding its total area, and but for its alliance with

Germany, Turkey could have been assured of retaining at least sixty thousand square miles of the Eastern Balkans." I do not know whether the *Chronicle* view is generally shared. Is it by way of punishment that Turkey is to undergo such shrinkage, or is it because justice demands it? If Turkey had not made the mistake of joining Germany, would the principle of nationality have been still applied to Armenia, Arabia, Mesopotamia and Palestine?

Let me now remind those who think with Mr. Candler that the promise was not made by Mr. Lloyd George to the people of India in anticipation of the supply of recruits continuing. In defending his own statement, Mr. Lloyd George is reported to have said :

"The effect of the statement in India was that recruiting went up appreciably from that very moment. They were not all Mahomedans but there were many Mahomedans amongst them. Now we are told that was an offer to Turkey. But they rejected it, and therefore we were absolutely free. It was not. It is too often forgotten that we are the greatest Mahomedan power in the world and that one-fourth of the population of the British Empire is Mahomedan. There have been no more loyal adherents to the throne and no more effective and loyal supporters of the Empire in its hour of trial. *We gave a solemn pledge and they accepted it.* They are disturbed by the prospect of our not abiding by it."

Who shall interpret that pledge and how? How did the Government of India itself interpret it? Did it or did it not energetically support the claim for the control of the Holy Places of Islam vesting in the Khalif? Did the Government of India suggest that the whole of Jazirat-ul-Arab could be taken away consistently with that pledge from the sphere of influence of the Khalif, and given over to the Allies as mandatory Powers? Why does the Government of India sympathise with the Indian Mussalmans if the terms are all they should be? So much for the pledge. I would like to guard myself against being understood that I stand or fall absolutely by Mr. Lloyd George's declaration. I have advisedly used the adverb 'practically' in connection with it. It is an important qualification.

Mr. Candler seems to suggest that my goal is something more than merely attaining justice on the Khilafat. If so, he is right. Attainment of justice is undoubtedly the corner-stone, and if I found that I was wrong in my conception of justice on this question, I hope I shall have the courage immediately to retrace my steps. But by helping the Mahomedans of India at a critical moment in their history, I want to buy their friendship. Moreover, if I can carry the Mahomedans with me I hope to wean Great Britain from the downward path along which the Prime Minister seems to me to be taking her. I hope also to show to India and the Empire at large that given a certain amount of capacity for self-

sacrifice, justice can be secured by peace fullest and cleanest means without sowing or increasing bitterness between English and Indians. For, whatever may be the temporary effect of my methods, I know enough of them to feel certain that they alone are immune from lasting bitterness. They are untainted with hatred, expedience or untruth.

IN PROCESS OF KEEPING.

The writer of 'Current Topics' in the "Times of India" has attempted to challenge the statement made in my Khilafat article regarding ministerial pledges, and in doing so, cites Mr. Asquith's Guild Hall speech of November 10, 1914. When I wrote the article, I had in mind Mr. Asquith's speech. I am sorry that he ever made that speech. For, in my humble opinion, it betrayed to say the least, a confusion of thought. Could he think of the Turkish people as apart from the Ottoman Government? And what is the meaning of the death-knell of Ottoman Dominion in Europe and Asia if it be not the death knell of Turkish people as a free and governing race? Is it, again, true historically that the Turkish rule has always been a blight that 'has withered some of the fairest regions of the earth?' And what is the meaning of his statement that followed, *viz.*, "Nothing is further from our thoughts than to imitate or encourage a crusade against their belief?" If words have any meaning, the qualifications that Mr. Asquith introduced in his speech should

have meant a scrupulous regard for Indian Muslim feeling. And if that be the meaning of his speech, without anything further to support me I would claim that even Mr. Asquith's assurance is in danger of being set at nought if the resolutions of the San Remo Conference are to be crystallised into action. But I base my remarks on a considered speech made by Mr. Asquith's successor two years later when things had assumed a more threatening shape than in 1914 and when the need for Indian help was much greater than in 1914. His pledge would bear repetition till it is fulfilled. He said: "Nor are we fighting to deprive Turkey of its capital or of the rich and renowned lands of Asia Minor and Thrace which are predominantly Turkish in race. "We do not challenge the maintenance of the Turkish Empire in the home-lands of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople." If only every word of this pledge is fulfilled both in letter and in spirit, there would be little left for quarrelling about. In so far as Mr. Asquith's declaration can be considered hostile to the Indian Muslim claim, it is superseded by the later and more considered declaration of Mr. Lloyd George—a declaration made irrevocable by fulfilment of the consideration it expected, *viz.*, the enlistment of the brave Mahomedan soldiery which fought in the very place which is now being partitioned in spite of the pledge. But the writer of 'Current Topics' says Mr. Lloyd George "is now in process of keeping his pledge." I hope he is right.

But what has already happened gives little ground for any such hope. For, imprisonment or internment of the Khalif in his own capital will be not only a mockery of fulfilment but it would be adding injury to insult. Either the Turkish Empire is to be maintained in the homelands of the Turkish race with its capital at Constantinople or it is not. If it is, let the Indian Mahomedans feel the full glow of it or if the Empire is to be broken up, let the mask of hypocrisy be lifted and India see the truth in its nakedness. To join the Khilafat movement then means to join a movement to keep inviolate the pledge of a British minister. Surely, such a movement is worth much greater sacrifice than may be involved in non-co-operation.

APPEAL TO THE VICEROY.

YOUR EXCELLENCY,

As one who has enjoyed a certain measure of your Excellency's confidence, and as one who claims to be a devoted well-wisher of the British Empire, I owe it to your Excellency, and through your Excellency to His Majesty's Ministers, to explain my connection with and my conduct in the Khilafat question.

At the very earliest stage of the war, even whilst I was in London organising the Indian Volunteer Ambulance Corps, I began to interest myself in the Khilafat question. I perceived how deeply moved the little Mussalman World in London was when

Turkey decided to throw in her lot with Germany. On my arrival in India in the January of 1915, I found the same anxiousness and earnestness among the Mussalmans with whom I came in contact. Their anxiety became intense when the information about the Secret Treaties leaked out. Distrust of British intentions filled their minds, and despair took possession of them. Even at that moment I advised my Mussalman friends not to give way to despair, but to express their fear and their hopes in a disciplined manner. It will be admitted that the whole of Mussalman India has behaved in a singularly restrained manner during the past five years, and that the leaders have been able to keep the turbulent sections of their community under complete control.

The peace terms and your Excellency's defence of them have given the Mussalmans of India a shock from which it will be difficult for them to recover. The terms violate ministerial pledges and utterly disregard Mussalman sentiment. I consider that as a staunch Hindu wishing to live on terms of the closest friendship with my Mussalman countrymen. I should be an unworthy son of India if I did not stand by them in their hour of trial. In my humble opinion, their cause is just. They claim that Turkey must be *punished* if their sentiment is to be respected. Muslim soldiers did fight to inflict punishment on their own Khalifa or to deprive him of his territories. The Mussalman attitude has been consistent throughout these five years.

My duty to the Empire to which I owe my loyalty requires me to resist the cruel violence that has been done to the Mussalman sentiment. So far as I am aware, Mussalmans and Hindus have as a whole lost faith in British justice and honour. The report of the majority of the Hunter Committee, Your Excellency's despatch thereon and Mr. Montagu's reply have only aggravated the distrust.

It is, then, because I believe in the British constitution that I have advised my Mussalman friends to withdraw their support from your Excellency's Government, and the Hindus to join them, should the peace terms not be revised in accordance with the solemn pledges of Ministers and the Muslim sentiment.

But there is yet an escape from non-co-operation. The Mussalman representation has requested your Excellency to lead the agitation yourself, as did your distinguished predecessor at the time of the South African trouble. But if you cannot see your way to do so, and non-co-operation becomes a dire necessity, I hope that your Excellency will give those who have accepted my advice and myself the credit for being actuated by nothing less than a stern sense of duty.

Laburnam Road,
Gamdevi, Bombay,

22nd June 1920.

I have the honour to remain,
Your Excellency's faithful
servant,

(Sd.) M. K. GANDHI.

KHILAFAT FOR HINDUS AS WELL AS MUSLIMS.

SANKARACHARYA'S VIEWS.

The following speech of Shri Jagad Guru Shri Shankaracharya, made by him on the day of release from prison, the 1st November, 1921, at Karachi at a public meeting will be read with interest :—

Friends, I am here before you to interpret, from my own characteristic spiritual standpoint, the inner meaning of the prosecution of us 7 people, in connection with the Resolution of July last here, in the Khilafat Conference, and the inner meaning of my acquittal along with the conviction of the remaining six. The first and most important point is that the prosecution rose in connection with the Resolution of the Khilafat Conference and therein along with six Muslim Workers of the Khilafat, a Hindu and a representative of ecclesiastical Hinduism was also arrested. What was a most important and significant act on the part of the Government !

The action of the Government in thus arresting me with six Muslim Leaders is a great moral object lesson to the country which every one of you should understand, take to heart, thoroughly grasp and faithfully practise. The Hindus in the country on the whole even those of them who were taking part in the political movement and even those who were Non-Co-operators were not taking sufficient interest in the Khilafat cause and the Government by arrest-

ing me has shown to the world that the Khilafat cause is the united cause and interest of the Hindus as well as the Musalmans. (Loud and continued cheers.)

There were hundreds and thousands— nay hundreds of thousands—of Hindus in the country, who were not taking interest in the Khilafat cause and my arrest has brought them into the political field as nothing else could have been able to do. To **take only one example** from Lucknow in the U. P. we find that there was a monster meeting of the orthodox Hindu people in connection with the protest against my arrest—a huge assembly of the people. There the Secretary of the Lucknow Aman Sabha and author of several Anti-Non-Co-operation pamphlets was the mover of the principal Resolution. And the last of the resolutions at that big public meeting of the Hindus of Lucknow with only one dissenting voice, declared that, as a protest against this action of the Government, those who had, so far been non-political and the rest of them Co-operators would henceforth be Non-Co-operators and follow me. Well I should like to make a contrast with the entire population of India, that if at least one city would come to pass a Non-Co-operation Resolution whenever I was arrested, I would cheerfully consent to be arrested day after day whole of the remainder of my life.

KHILAFAT—BOTH FOR HINDUS AND MOSLEMS.

Well, the Government by its action, in arresting me, along with six Muslims has shown to Hindu India, that the Hindus should not neglect to take interest in the Khilafat, and that the Khilafat cause is therefore, of Hindus as well as of the Musalmans. This is the great moral that Government is teaching India to-day. Even in the final summing up to the Jury, the Judicial Commissioner, stated that I was a prominent supporter. Though he was going to acquit me of the charges under various Sections, he did not retract statement that I was a sympathiser with and upholder of the Khilafat. The Khilafat is thus also for Hindu India and not merely for Muslim India. (Cheer.) Well, this is the first moral *i.e.* that the Khilafat is for the Hindu, and also for the Musalman.

Now I wish to give you my reading of the inner meaning of my acquittal, along with the conviction of the rest of my co-accused. There is a general rule of conduct that a person who has long failed to perform a duty makes an intense effort in various ways to make amends, expitiate and atone thereof.

I hereafter shall not be one amongst seven, but seven men working under one body. Originally, I was one person amongst seven. I have long worked with them and for 48 days I have been an under trial prisoner with them. Having worked with them and been under-trial prisoner with them, I shall have to

bear the burden of all the seven. I shall have to do, not merely my sacerdotal work as the Jagat Guru but also the work of the others, who are still in prison. Even as Jagat Guru, I was working for the Khilafat cause, but with my other duties, I was only half a Khilafat Worker. But now six portions have been added to me, and I shall thus have to do the Khilafat Work of $6\frac{1}{2}$; their six and my half. This is the message which I understand that the Government has to-day communicated to India.

THE THREE BLOOD BROTHERS.

In the Hindu Shastra we have a rule that an outsider shall not sit for public or for private purposes, whether at a dinner, or a public reception between two brothers. Recently when our photographs were being taken at the Court, I deliberately sat between the Ali Brothers thereby making all three of us blood brothers according to the Hindu Shastra. (Loud and continued cheers.)

A MOMENTOUS ISSUE.

I shall say a few words to you now about the further moral signification of the whole proceedings in this case, which has thus ended to-day. The question is not one of Section 131, 505, 120A, and so forth, but merely of "God-made Law versus Man-made one." India, as a part of the Eastern world, is renowned for its spirituality everywhere as against the fleshy instincts of the Western World. This is a

momentous issue forced on us in its final shape *i.e.* whether India to-day shall acknowledge the supremacy of God or of Man, of the spirit or of the flesh *i.e.* whether India shall continue to be India or cease to be India. —

Well the question is easy to answer from the point of view of every religion in the world. If we take the Christian religion itself we find that in the Old Testament the Mosaic Law of the Hebrews laid it down that even kings were to pay their sin * * * * the Crown to understand. The question which people are freely asking is, was he implicated because all the other accused were Musalmans and the prosecution did not want to give the trial a sectarian or religious character?

Unhappily we cannot say that the substance of the summing-up was quite fair. It is a most important part of the business of the Judge to interpret the law to the jury. Did the Judge in this case interpret the law properly? Did he point to the jury the protection afforded to accused persons by the Exception under Section 505 which provides that where the person making the alleged incriminating statement has reasonable grounds for believing that the statement is true and makes it without the intent of causing any employee in military or naval service to fail in his duty as such he perpetrates no offence? We are no lawyers, but taking a common sense view of the matter it does appear to us that the whole question before the Judge and jury in this case was

whether this Exception protected the accused in the present case. This at any rate is what we gather to be the substance of the accused's contention. They claimed in the first place that the statement of Islamic religion was true and secondly that their object in making it was not that Government servants would fail in their duty to the State but that they should not fail in their duty to God as enjoined by their religion. As regards the first of these claims the Judge brushed it aside by saying that it was irrelevant, because whatever the dictate of Islamic religion might be, the law must take its course. In our opinion this was a grave misapprehension for the simple reason that the law itself makes ample provision for this aspect of the matter being taken into consideration in the first part of the Exception. The second claim does appear to us to be substantially true. It is not the object of the accused to prevent soldiers from doing their duty as such, but to make them cease to be soldiers. The question of failure of duty as a soldier could arise only in the case of a man who remains a soldier ; it cannot arise in the case of a soldier who ceases to be one on conscientious grounds. Undoubtedly there is the question of contract, but those who give a general advice to soldiers or others to give up service on religious grounds are clearly thinking not of their contractual but of their religious obligations, and can plead that even if the carrying out of their advice involve the violation of the former, they are, at any rate, not

asking any one to evade the lawful consequences of such violation. Looked at from this point of view, the case is really on all fours with that of men who are opposed to all wars and all violence on conscientious grounds, and who consider it their duty to propagate their view. In our humble opinion both the Judge in his summing and the jury in its verdict made a mistake in ignoring this aspect of the matter ; and the mistake of the Judge was even greater in so far as he failed to take this aspect into his consideration in awarding sentence. Reading between the lines of the jury's verdict, this appears to us to be precisely what they themselves expected the judge to do. There was no point in their special mention of the fact that they had not taken into account the deep-rooted religious convictions of the accused in arriving at their verdict if they did not mean to convey that the Judge should do what they, according to the limited nature of their commission had been unable to do. The maximum sentence was not and could not possibly have been intended for this class of case.

PANDIT MADAN MOHAN MALAVIYA ON KHILAFAT.

So far as the Khilafat is concerned we used to hear that England regarded Turkey as a great friend. English statesmen used often to acknowledge the friendly services of Turkey in the past, and they were anxious to protect Turkey as long as there was

a danger of invasion from Russia. Times changed, and policies changed, and then came the Balkan war, and after it came the great European war. By stress of circumstances into which it is unnecessary for me to enter, Turkey joined the war against the Allies. The Allies triumphed and the Allies have now to lay down the terms of the Turkish Treaty. If the Allies had only remembered the promises that they had made during the progress of the war, if the Allies had only acted up to the pledges which they had given to our Mussalman fellow-subjects in India, who went to fight against Turkey on behalf of England, this question of the Khilafat would not have arisen to-day. *But the question has been the creation of England ; it is not of our creation.* We, Hindus feel, apart from any consideration of diplomacy, that the great fight which was fought for righteousness has ended in an un-righteous attitude on the part of England. We feel that instead of the victory proving the harbinger of a new era of freedom for small and great nations it has served to be a new instrument for enslaving other peoples on the earth. This is the reason of the sympathy which, I believe, the Hindus generally, the Parsees generally, the Indian Christians generally feel with our fellow countrymen. It is the unrighteousness of the attitude adopted by England. We feel also that a great nation like the Musalman nation, which has had a glorious past, ought not to be subjected to the position, reduced to the position to which

they propose to reduce Turkey. For all these reasons, and knowing that millions of our Musalman countrymen and countrywomen are sore at heart and feel deeply on this Turkish question, we are face to face with this situation that the feelings of the Indian Musalmans have been outraged and they are undergoing mental pain, and that that pain shall not end until some remedy has been found for it.

SUCCESSIVE KHALIFAS OF ISLAM.

(Being the up-to-date list of the successors of the Holy Prophet Hazrat Muhammad, on whom be God's Peace and Blessings)

KHULFA-I-RASHEDIN (632 A.D.—661 A.D.)

No.	Elected Khalifa	A.H.	A.D.
1.	HAZRAT ABU BAKR AS-SIDDIQ ...	11	632
2.	HAZRAT UMAR BIN KHATTAB ...	13	634
3.	HAZRAT USMAN BIN AFFAN ...	23	644
4.	HAZRAT ALI ABI TALIB ...	35	652

THE UMMAYYAD KHALIFAS (661 A.D.—749 A.D.)

5.	MAA WIYA BIN ABI SUFIYAN ...	41	661
6.	YAZID BIN MAAWIYA ...	60	680
7.	MAAWIYA BIN YAZID ...	64	683
8.	MARWAN BIN AL HAKAM ...	64	683
9.	ABDUL MALIK BIN MARWAN ...	65	684
10.	AL WALID BIN ABDUL MALIK ...	76	705
11.	SULAIMAN BIN ABDUL MALIK ...	96	714
12.	UMAR BIN ABDUL AZIZ ...	99	717
13.	YAZID BIN ABDUL MALIK ...	101	719
14.	HASHAM BIN ABDUL MALIK ...	105	723

No.		Elected Khalifa	
		A.H.	A.D.
15.	AL WALID BIN YAZID ...	125	742
16.	YAZID BIN AL WALID ...	126	743
17.	IBRAHIM BIN AL WALID ...	126	743
18.	MARWAN BIN MUHAMMAD ...	127	744

ABBASIDE KHALIFAS (749 A.D.—1258 A.D.)

19.	ABUL ABBAS SAFFAH ...	132	749
20.	ABU JAFAR MAUSUR ...	137	754
21.	AL MAHDI BIN MAUSUR ...	158	774
22.	AL HADI BIN AL MAHDI ...	169	785
23.	HARUN AL (AR) RASHID BIN AL MAHDI	170	786
24.	MUHAMMAD AL AMIN BIN HARUN ...	193	808
25.	AL MAMUN BIN HARUN ...	198	813
26.	AL MUTASIM BIN HARUN ...	218	833
27.	AL WASIQ BIN AL MUTASIM ...	227	842
28.	AL MUTAWAKKAL AL ALLAH BIN AL MUTASIM ...	232	847
29.	AL MUS TANSIR BI ALLAH ...	247	861
30.	AL MUSTAIN BI ALLAH ...	248	862
31.	AL MUTAZ BI ALLAH ...	252	866
32.	AL MUHTADI BI ALLAH ...	255	869
33.	AL MUTAMID BI ALLAH ...	256	870
34.	AL MUTAZID BI ALLAH ...	279	892
35.	AL MUQTADIR BI ALLAH ...	295	908
36.	AL (R) RAZI BI ALLAH ...	322	933
37.	AL MUQTAFI BI ALLAH ...	329	940
38.	AL MUSTAQFI BI ALLAH ...	333	944
39.	AL MUTI BI ALLAH ...	343	946
40.	AL TAI' LI ALLAH ...	363	974
41.	AL QADIR BI AMR ALLAH ...	381	991
42.	AL QAIM BI AMR ALLAH ...	432	1031
43.	AL MUQTADI BI ALLAH ...	467	1075
44.	AL MUSTAZ HAR BI ALLAH ...	487	1094
45.	AL MUSTARSHID BI ALLAH ...	512	1118
46.	AL (R) RASHID ...	529	1135
47.	AL MUQTAFI BIN AL MUSTAZHAR ...	530	1136

No.		Elected Khalifa	
		A.H.	A.D.
48.	AL MUSTANJID BI ALLAH	... 555	1160
49.	AL MUSTAZI BI AMRILLAH	... 566	1170
50.	AL (N) NASIR LI DINILLAH	... 575	1180
51.	AL (Z) ZAHIR BI ALLAH 622	1222
52.	AL MUSTANSIR BI ALLAH	... 623	1223
53.	AL MUSTASAM BI ALLAH	... 640	1243

ABBASIDE KHALIFAS OF EGYPT (1258 A.D.—1517 A.D.)

54.	AL MUSTANSIR BI ALLAH	... 656	1258
55.	AL HAKAM BI AMRILLAH	... 661	1262
56.	AL MUSTAKFI BI ALLAH	... 701	1301
57.	AL WASIQ BI ALLAH 740	1339
58.	AL HAKAM BI AMRILLAH	... 742	1341
59.	AL MUTAZID BI ALLAH	... 753	1352
60.	AL MUTAWAKKAL AL ALLAH	... 763	1361
61.	AL WASIQ BI ALLAH 785	1383
62.	AL MUSTAIN BI ALLAH 808	1401
63.	AL MUTAZID BI ALLAH 815	1412
64.	AL MUSTAKFI BI ALLAH 840	1441
65.	AL QAAIM BI AMRILLAH 854	1450
66.	AL MUSTANJID BI ALLAH	... 859	1454
67.	AL MUTAWAKKIL AL ALLAH	... 903	1497
68.	AL MUSTAMSIK BI ALLAH	... 903	1497
69.	AL MUTWAKKAL AL ALLAH	... 912	1506

OTTOMAN KHALIFAS (1517 A.D.—)

70.	SELIM I	923	1517
71.	SULAIMAN I	926	1520
72.	SELIM II	947	1566
73.	MURAD III	952	1574
74.	MUHAMMAD III	1004	1596
75.	AHMAD I	1012	1604
76.	MUSTAFA I	1027	1618
77.	USMAN II	1027	1618

No.			Elected Khalifa	
			A.H.	A.D.
78.	MURAD IV	...	1032	1623
79.	IBRAHIM I	...	1049	1640
80.	MUHAMMAD IV	...	1053	1674
81.	SULAIMAN II	...	1099	1687
82.	AHMAD II	...	1102	1691
83.	MUSTAFA II	...	1106	1695
84.	AHMAD III	...	1115	1703
85.	MAHMUD I	...	1142	1730
86.	USMAN III	...	1166	1754
87.	MUSTAFA III	...	1171	1754
88.	ABDUL MAJID I	...	1187	1773
89.	SELIM III	...	1203	1789
90.	MUSTAFA IV	...	1222	1807
91.	MAHMUD II	...	1223	1808
92.	ABDUL HAMID I	...	1255	1839
93.	ABDUL AZIZ	...	1277	1861
94.	MURAD V	...	1293	1876
95.	ABDUL HAMID II	...	1293	1876
96.	MUHAMMAD V	...	1326	1909
97.	MUHAMMAD VI, 1916, WAHIDUDDIN who betrayed his country and his faith and violated his oath of constitution by placing the sacred Khilafat of Islam under the protection of the Allies, and escaped on board the "Malaya" with his son, some attendants, two tin trunks, and a leather suit-case.			
98.	ABDUL MAJID II, elected by the Grand National Assembly of Turkey, and saluted as the Khalifa of Islam in the Khutba on Friday, November 14th, 1922, in the mosque of Sultan Muhammad, the Conqueror.			



3P Abbās, M H

66.9 All about the Khilafat, with the views of Mahatma G
2 others; together with full details of the Indian Khilaf
gation in Europe headed by Mawlana Mohammed Ali.
parts. By M. H. Abbas ... Calcutta, Ray & Ray Cho
[1923].

[4], 368 p. 1 fold. map. 18 $\frac{1}{2}$ ".

"Successive Khakufas of Islam" p. 365-36

1. Caliphate. 2. Turkey--History. I. Gandhi
Mohandas Karamchand, 1869-1948. II. Title.

CCS

330290

